



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114653025>

DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF UNITED CANADA
1841-1867

Centre de recherche en histoire/History Research Centre

DEBATES OF
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF UNITED CANADA

VOLUME XIII, PART V

1856

Edited by
Danielle Blais

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE (CRH)
HISTORY RESEARCH CENTRE (HRC)
Concordia University, 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West, ER 400-23
Montréal, Québec H3G 1M8

DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF UNITED CANADA

1841-1867

Centre de recherche en histoire/History Research Centre

DEBATES OF
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF UNITED CANADA

VOLUME XIII, PART V

1856

Edited by
Danielle Blais

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE (CRH)
HISTORY RESEARCH CENTRE (HRC)
Concordia University, 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West, ER 400-23
Montréal, Québec H3G 1M8

DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF UNITED CANADA
1841-1867

Published under the direction of the

HISTORY RESEARCH CENTRE
CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE

Room ER 400-23, Concordia University, Sir George Williams Campus
Montréal, Québec
H3G 1M8

Executive Committee

Jack Bumsted (University of Manitoba)

Ramsay Cook (York University)

Jean Hamelin (Université Laval)

Peter Waite (Dalhousie University)

Jean-Pierre Wallot (Directeur, Archives du Canada)

The research funds for the reconstruction of the *Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada* have been provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and by the Faculty of Arts and Science of Concordia University. This Volume has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and the Social Science Federation of Canada, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and with a grant from The Ontario Heritage Foundation, an agency of the Ministry of Culture and Communications for the Province of Ontario.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jeannot Blackburn, Marie-Michèle Cholette, Erika Johnson, Pamela Lee, Geneviève Legault, Frank McDonough, Lorraine Payette and Claire Samson assisted in the production of this volume. The following pages are a testimony to their careful labour and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ADDENDUM TO NEWSPAPER TABLE	viii
ADDENDUM TO LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	ix
THURSDAY, 15 MAY 1856	2043
FRIDAY, 16 MAY 1856	2085
MONDAY, 19 MAY / TUESDAY, 20 MAY 1856	2127
WEDNESDAY, 21 MAY 1856	2179
FRIDAY, 23 MAY 1856	2180
MONDAY, 26 MAY 1856	2197
TUESDAY, 27 MAY 1856	2221
WEDNESDAY, 28 MAY 1856	2254
THURSDAY, 29 MAY 1856	2273
FRIDAY, 30 MAY 1856	2315
MONDAY, 2 JUNE 1856	2339
TUESDAY, 3 JUNE 1856	2363
THURSDAY, 5 JUNE 1856	2396
FRIDAY, 6 JUNE 1856	2419
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES	2447

ADDENDUM TO NEWSPAPER TABLE

The Introduction to Volume XIII, found in Part I, includes a list of 16 newspapers used in the reconstitution of the Debates of the Session of 1856. For the Debates of Volume XIII, Part V, the following information also applies:

NEWSPAPERS	ORIGIN OF REPORTS
HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY	Mostly copied excerpts from the <i>Globe</i> and the <i>Toronto Daily Leader</i> . An original report is provided for the proceedings of 15 May 1856.
LA MINERVE	Translated from Lower and Upper Canada newspapers (mostly the <i>Montreal Gazette</i> and the <i>Globe</i>). One original report is provided for the speech of Mr. Loranger on 26 May 1856.
LE PAYS	Translated from Lower and Upper Canada newspapers (mostly the <i>Montreal Gazette</i> and the <i>Globe</i>).
MONTREAL GAZETTE	Sometimes original, sometimes copied Upper Canada newspapers (especially the <i>Globe</i>).

ADDENDUM TO
LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
AND THEIR CONSTITUENCIES

FIFTH PARLIAMENT, SECOND SESSION
15 FEBRUARY 1856 — 1 JULY 1856

The information provided in the List of Members in Volume XIII, Part I, is applicable for the remainder of the Session of 1856, except for the following:

Bellingham, Sydney ¹	Argenteuil (L.C.)
Morrison, Joseph Curran ²	Niagara (U.C.)
Terrill, Timothy Lee ³	Stanstead (L.C.)

1. S. Bellingham's second election as representative for Argenteuil was declared null and void on 3 April 1856; he was re-elected on 12 May 1856.
2. J.C. Morrison was appointed Receiver General on 24 May 1856; he was re-elected on 20 June 1856.
3. T.L. Terrill was appointed Provincial Secretary on 24 May 1856; he was re-elected on 10 June 1856.

THURSDAY, 15 MAY 1856

(515)

MR. SPEAKER communicated to the House the following Letter: —

Government House,
Toronto, 14th May, 1856.

(516)

Sir, — I am directed by His Excellency the Governor General to inform you, that it is His Excellency's intention to proceed to the Legislative Council Chamber on Friday next, the 16th instant, at half-past Three o'clock, for the purpose of assenting to certain Bills passed by the Legislative Council and Assembly.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
R. T. Pennefather.

The Honorable the Speaker
of the Legislative Assembly.

—
The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Frazer*, — The Petition of *John Graybeil* and others, of the Township of *Humberstone*, County of *Welland*; and the Petition of *J.S. Price* and others, of the Township of *Pelham*, County of *Welland*.

By Mr. *Octave Cyrille Fortier*, — Two Petitions of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Gervais*, County of *Bellechasse*.

By Mr. *James Smith*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the United Townships of *Verulam* and *Sommerville*, County of *Victoria*.

By Mr. *Scatcherd*, — The Petition of *Donald McDonald* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; the Petition of *Ebenezer Turrill* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; the Petition of *John O'Gorman* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; the Petition of *Henry Burgess* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; the Petition of *John Tucker* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; and the Petition of *H. Purdy* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of *Joseph Verrette* and others, of *St. Alban*; praying that no further guarantee may be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and that the claim of the North Shore Railway Company should, as a right, be favorably considered by the Government.

Of *J. Godet* and others, of *St. Edouard de Gentilly*; of *François Leduc* and others, of *St. Clément*; and of *Jean Desjardins* and others, of the Parish of *St. Joseph de la Rivière des Prairies*; praying that no further guarantee may be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Of *C. Préfontaine* and others, of the Parish of *St. Marc*, County of *Verchères*; praying for the abolition of Tithes.

Of *John Wells* and others, of the Township of *King*; and of *William Barber* and others, of the Township of *Arran*; praying that representation may be based upon population.

Of *Hilaire Michaud* and others, of *Notre Dame du Portage*, County of *Temiscouata*; of *Henry Maureant* and others, of *Notre Dame du Portage*, County of *Temiscouata*; of *G.H. Beaulieu* and others, of the Parish of *St. Alexandre*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Rivière du Loup*, County of *Temiscouata*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Trois Pistoles*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. George de Kakouna*; of the Municipal Council of the County of *Temiscouata*; and of the Municipality of the Village of *Fraserville*; praying that *Rivière du Loup* may be made the chief place of the *Kamouraska* District for Judicial purposes.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Arsène de Kakouna*; praying that the Village of *Fraserville* may be made the chief place of the *Kamouraska* District, for Judicial purposes.

(517)

Of the Reverend *T. Aubert DeGaspé* and others, of the Parish of *St. Eloi*, County of *Temiscouata*; praying that *Rivière du Loup* or *Green Island* may be made the chief place of the *Kamouraska* District for Judicial purposes.

Of *Jean Larivée* and others, of the Parish of *Ste. Luce*, County of *Rimouski*; praying that the works already in course of construction at *Rimouski* may be continued, to make a Port of Refuge, and the Terminus of the Railroad from *Trois Pistoles*.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Luce*, County of *Rimouski*; and of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Germain de Rimouski*; praying for the formation of a new Judicial District, and that *Rimouski* may be made the chief place.

Of the Municipal Council of the Town of *Simcoe*; praying for an Act of Incorporation to construct a line of Railway from the Town of *Simcoe* to some point on the Great Western Railway between *Fairchild's Creek* and *Hamilton*.

Of the *Hamilton* Board of Trade; and of the Municipality of the Township of *Woodhouse*; praying that the Bill now before the House to incorporate the *Norfolk, Brant, and Wentworth* Railway Company, may not become law.

Of *W.H. Lemoine* and others, of *St. Ferréol* and other Parishes of *la Côte Beaupré*; praying aid for Roads and certain other improvements in the County of *Montmorenci*.

Of *William Barber* and others, of the Township of *Arran*; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.

Of the Reverend *L. Doolittle* and others, Members of Universities in *Lower Canada*; praying that the Bill to make better provision for the promotion of Superior Education in *Lower Canada*, may be so amended as to exempt Universities in *Lower Canada* from certain duties at present contemplated by the said Bill, and to confer certain privileges upon the Members thereof.

Mr. *Fergusson*, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presented to the House the Seventeenth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have considered the following Bills, and have agreed to certain amendments to each, which they beg to submit for the consideration of Your Honorable House, viz: —

Bill to vest a certain Road allowance in *Horace Capron* and *Myron Ames*:

Bill to incorporate certain persons therein named under the style and title of the Millers' Association of *Canada West*:

Bill to authorize *Henry Augustus Fitzgerald McLeod* to practise as a Provincial Land Surveyor.

They have also examined the Bill to authorize a Survey of and establish the Concession line between the seventh and eighth Concessions of *Clarke*, and for other purposes, and find the Preamble not proven; for if the Petitioners applying for the Bill are laboring under any grievance, it is of a nature for which the Laws already provide a remedy.

Mr. *James Smith*, from the Standing Committee on Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines, presented to the House the Tenth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have considered the Bill to amend the Act of Incorporation of the *Woodstock* [sic] and *Lake Erie* Railway and Harbour Company referred to them, and have agreed to several amendments, which they humbly submit for the adoption of Your Honorable House.

Ordered, That the Bill to amend the Act of Incorporation of the *Woodstock* and *Lake Erie* Railway and Harbour Company, with the amendments, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

(518)

Mr. *Stevenson*, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented to the House the Eighteenth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have examined the Return to an Address for a Return of the Amounts due in each year since the sale of the Government Roads, the date of the several payments on account thereof, and amount due and unpaid on 31st December, 1855; and recommend that the usual number of copies be printed: estimated expense, Four pounds fifteen shillings.

The attention of Your Committee has been drawn to the Accounts of the Queen's Printer, for Printing performed by him for Your Honorable House, by Order of the Government.

Your Committee have duly considered the matter, and recommend that these Accounts be paid out of the Contingencies of Your Honorable House, after being checked and examined in

the same manner as are those of the contractors, and that the price to be allowed for this work, be the same as that charged under the contracts for the time being; and that these Accounts, as well as all others for Printing, Binding, and the supply of Printing Paper, at the commencement of each Session, be laid before, audited and examined, by the Standing Committee on Printing, preparatory to their being laid before the Committee on Contingencies, as forming a part of the general expenditure of Your Honorable House.

Ordered, That the said Report be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

Ordered, That the Bill to incorporate certain persons therein named under the style and title of the Millers' Association of *Canada West*, as reported from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, be committed to a Committee of the whole House.

On motion of MR. GAMBLE,¹

(518) *Resolved*, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the said Committee.
The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee;

The 9th clause [sic], giving the Company general powers to deal in grain, flour, and other agricultural produce, was thrown out by 26 to 19.²

MR. GAMBLE said if that clause were struck out, the Bill might be as well destroyed altogether.³

A clause was inserted providing that the business to be carried on should be that of the Corn Exchange.⁴

The committee [rose].⁵

(518) and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Chisholm* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made amendments thereunto.

MR. GAMBLE moved that the report of the committee be now received.⁶

(518) And the Question being put, That the Report be now received; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Bell, Biggar, Brodeur, Brown, Bureau, Cameron, Cartier, Chabot, Christie, Clarke, Cook, Charles Daoust, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, Desaulniers, DeWitt, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Felton, Fergusson, Foley, Thomas Fortier, Fournier, Galt, Gamble, Gould, Guévremont, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Marchildon, Joseph C. Morrison, Munro, Murney, Papin, Polette, Prévost, Price, Solicitor General Ross, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Solicitor General Smith, Southwick, Spence, Whitney, Wilson, and Wright.* — (58.)

(518-519)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Bourassa, Casault, Chapais, Chisholm, Crawford, Delong, Dufresne, Evanturel, Laberge, McCann, Meagher, Patrick, Poulin, Pouliot, Rhodes, Robinson, Shaw, Sidney Smith, and James Smith.* — (19.)

(519)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Mr. *Chisholm* reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendments were read, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

Ordered, That the Bill to vest a certain Road allowance in *Horace Capron* and *Myron Ames*, as reported from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, be committed to a Committee of the whole House.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the said Committee.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Hartman* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made an amendment thereunto.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. *Hartman* reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendment was read, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Honorable Mr. *Cartier*, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, pursuant to Addresses to His Excellency the Governor General, — Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 5th instant, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before the House, a Return shewing the Names of the parties to whom a new "Reserve Fund for uncommuted Stipends, Widows' Annuities, &c.," of Forty-four thousand four hundred and forty-one pounds seven shillings and ten pence, is assumed or proposed to be set apart, in page 241 of the Public Accounts, for *Upper Canada*, and of One thousand nine hundred and four pounds thirteen shillings and nine pence in *Lower Canada*; also, a Statement of all sums of money paid out of the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves in *Upper* and *Lower Canada*, to any Church, Religious denomination or individual, or on any account whatever, during the fiscal year 1855, and down to as late a date in 1856 as possible; together with copies of any Correspondence between the Government and parties affected by the above named reservation of money.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 36.)

Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 5th instant, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before the House, a Return of the number of acres of land purchased by the person holding the right of the allowance granted to *Clark Gamble* by Order in Council, the Agency at which such sale took place, the price per acre of such land, how long the said land has been open for sale, and the amount deducted from such sale on account of the claim of *Clark Gamble*, and the term granted for the payment of the balance due.

By Command.

Geo. Et. Cartier,

Secretary.

Secretary's Office,

Toronto, 14th May, 1856.

Crown Land Department,

Toronto, 12th May, 1856.

(520)

Sir, — I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter of the 8th instant, requesting to be furnished, for the information of the Legislative Assembly, with a Return of the number of acres of land purchased by the person holding the right of the allowance granted to *Clark Gamble*, Esquire, by Order in Council, the Agency at which such sale took place, the price per acre of such land, how long the said land has been open for sale, and the amount deducted from such sale on account of the claim of *Clark Gamble*, and the term granted for the balance due; and I beg leave to state that on the 30th May, 1855, a circular Letter addressed to various Agents of this Department, a copy of which is transmitted herewith, issued in favor of *William Proudfoot*, Esquire, under an assignment from Mr. *Gamble*, in his favor. And it is not known to this Department that such claim has been satisfied by an appropriation of land.

It may be desirable to add, that the claim of *Oliver Everts* to a grant of One thousand five hundred acres, upon which Mr. *Gamble's* case was based, was subject to the payment of certain Fees; and that the sum of Fifty-one pounds nineteen shillings and seven pence was paid into this office previously to the issue of a circular Letter upon the Local Agents taking place.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

Joseph Cauchon,

Commissioner.

Honorable *George E. Cartier*, M.P.,

Provincial Secretary, &c., &c., &c.

Crown Land Office,

Quebec, 30th May, 1855.

Sir, — The Government having decided, by an Order in Council dated the 27th February, 1855, that Mr. *Clark Gamble*, of *Toronto*, as the assignee of *George Everts*, the heir at law of *Oliver Everts*, deceased, was, under the Land Act of 1842, (4th and 5th *Victoria*, cap. 100) entitled to Scrip equivalent to fifteen hundred acres, which under the 5th Section of that Act prescribes the calculating the value of such grant at the price of Four shillings currency per acre, and which Order in Council above named authorizes, after payment of the Crown Fees to which the original claim was subject, and which has been made, an appropriation of land in satisfaction of the claim in question now taking place, you will therefore have the goodness to permit Mr. *Gamble*, by his assignee *William Proudfoot*, Esquire, to select any disposable Crown Lands within your Agency, to cover the said claim of Fifteen hundred acres, calculated at the par of Scrip as hereinbefore alluded to, namely, Four shillings per acre, entering the same as a purchase, and requiring Mr. *Proudfoot* to make a payment as such, in the proportion of One shilling per acre on the said claim of Fifteen hundred acres. You will accordingly perceive that this claim calculated as required by the Act, at Four shillings per acre, will represent the sum of £300, to which value you will please to allot land to Mr. *Proudfoot*, on payment of the sum of Seventy-five pounds, being the charge to be made on the claim in question at the rate of One shilling per acre.

I have, &c.,

(Signed,)

Joseph Cauchon,
Commissioner.

John Alexander, Esquire,
Agent for Public Lands, or the Agents for
the Commissioner of Crown Lands for
the Counties of *Grey*, *Simcoe*, *Huron*,
Bruce, or *Wellington*.

Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 5th instant, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before the House, a Statement of the unexpended balance of the Lunatic Asylum Fund in *Upper Canada*.

By Command.

Geo. Et. Cartier,

Secretary.

Secretary's Office,
Toronto, 13th May, 1856.

A Statement of the unexpended Balances of the Lunatic Asylum Fund in *Upper Canada*, up to the 31st January, 1856: —

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Amount at Credit of Lunatic Asylum, as per Public Accounts, 1855, folio 9				27975	12	7
do granted towards the Erection of the Buildings, Act 13 & 14 Vic. caps. 2 & 18	15000	0	0			
Less, expended per Public Accounts, folio 6	14884	8	0			
				115	12	0
Amount granted under Act 18 Vic. cap. 90				5000	0	0
Total Amount	£			33091	4	7

N.B. — Of the above amount, £25,000 is applicable towards the extension of the Lunatic Asylum, under Act 18 Vic. cap. 90.

Inspector's [sic] General's Office,
Toronto, 12th May, 1856.

William Dickinson,
Acting Deputy Inspector General.

The Honorable Mr. *Cartier* also laid before the House, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, — Annual Report of University College for the year 1855.

For the said Report, see Appendix (No. 11.)

Ordered, That the Bill to authorize *Henry Augustus Fitzgerald McLeod* to practice as a Provincial Land Surveyor, as reported from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, be committed to a Committee of the whole House.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the said Committee.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Angus Morrison* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed him to report the same, without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

MR. MURNEY moved as a matter of privilege, that Sidney Bellingham, Esq., having been returned by acclamation [sic], do take his seat for the county of Argenteuil [sic].⁷

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said no official return of that election had as yet been received by him.⁸ The usual obligations must be complied with, and the necessary document produced.⁹

MR. MURNEY referred to the member for Renfrew who was recently admitted in a similar manner.¹⁰

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the gentleman alluded to presented his indenture, and at the very time the motion for his admission, on that ground alone, was made, it was stated that such an act should be no precedent for the future, but that the House would adhere to the usual practice.¹¹

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that Mr. Bellingham had his indenture, and he did not think there could be any doubt of his having been returned with acclamation.¹² [He] moved, "That Sidney Bellingham, member elect for the county of Argenteuil [sic], having taken the usual oath, be now allowed to take his seat upon production of the duplicate of the indenture only," &c.¹³

[The motion was] carried.¹⁴

After some little delay ... [MR. BELLINGHAM] appeared at the bar, and was escorted to his seat by MESSRS. CAMERON and POWELL.¹⁵

(521) *Sydney Bellingham*, Esquire, having presented the Indenture of his Election for the County of *Argenteuil*, and previously taken the Oath according to Law, and subscribed before the Commissioners the Roll containing the same, took his Seat in the House.

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Drummond*, seconded by Mr. *Murney*,

Resolved, That in admitting *Sydney Bellingham*, Esquire, elected to represent the County of *Argenteuil*, to take his Seat on the production of the Duplicate Indenture only, and without the Return of the Indenture to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the Certificate of the latter Officer, this House still recommends a strict adherence to the practice of requiring the production of the usual Certificate.

(522) A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fennings Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery: —

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council have passed the following Bills, without Amendment; viz: —

Bill, intituled, "An Act to explain and amend the Charter of the *Brockville* Gas Light Company:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to vest in *Daniel Burritt* a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *Marlborough*:" And also,

The Legislative Council have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Militia Law," to which they desire the concurrence of this House.

And then he withdrew.

The House resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, yesterday, proposed to be made to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply); and which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, conveying to him the expression that the position which His Excellency's Administration have assumed up to the present day, on the Question of the Seat of Government, does not inspire this House with the confidence necessary to entrust that Administration with the moneys required for the construction of the necessary Buildings at the Seat of Government" inserted instead thereof;¹⁶

MR. PAPIN said that the question now to be discussed was of great importance. Since the alternative system had been introduced there had been no session without an attempt being made to establish a fixed Seat of Government. It was a matter that interested all the country; but the Government still refused to take it up. He thought instead of that the Government should have made it a Ministerial question. At any rate¹⁷, the Government after the vote of the house, ought to have chosen one of two alternatives, either to propose such a vote as would complete the buildings at Quebec, or to take their stand against permanence, and failing to obtain from [sic] the house a rescis[s]ion of its vote, to resign.¹⁸ He had always been frankly in favor of a permanent Seat of Government, and was so still, no matter where it was fixed. But he regarded the present proposition as a mere evasion. What would the Government do with this £50,000? The Board of Works had reported that the cost of these buildings would be £300,000. This £50,000 must then be only a commencement; and unless ministers meant to violate the privileges of the House, they could not on that vote give out the necessary contracts.¹⁹ The fact was, that the proposed vote was a mere attempt to nullify the determination arrived at in favor of Quebec, and amusing the House in the meantime.²⁰ As regarded want of confidence in the ministry, the confidence at one time reposed in it by certain members had of late been greatly diminished. At present the whole Press of Upper Canada, including those newspapers lately favourable to them, were against them, and that press was in accordance with every other expression of public opinion. What indeed had they done for the good of the country, after the house had been three months in session? The Legislative Council Bill was the only measure which they could claim as passed. They had, it was true, brought in a Police Bill, which they had alleged was absolutely necessary to save society from disruption. In spite, however, of this importance, the Bill had remained at the first reading, and the Government were too weak to advance it further. There had also been promise of a measure relative to the reform of prisons, but that too had made no advances. So with education. Ameliorations had been promised in the Speech from the Throne, but nothing had yet been done in the sense of the engagement entered into by the announcement in the Speech from the Throne. The truth was that ministers had no confidence, the one in the other.²¹ The Attorney General East had no confidence in the estimates of the Board of Works. The last importation into the body [Mr. J. Morrison] also had the day before he became minister proposed to vote non-confidence in his present colleagues.²² The question now was whether the house would take on itself to leave these men in power for another twelvemonth — men who had thrown the railway policy of the country into confusion, and who had yet to enter on a more difficult stage of the business — men too, who had increased the tariff, without diminishing the embarrassments of the country. (Hear, hear.)²³

MR. HOLTON with the consent of the hon. member for L'Assomption, moved as an amendment to the motion, "that all after the word 'that' be stru[c]k out, and the following inserted, 'that the Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that it be resolved, that the course of the Administration, with reference to the question of the Seat of Government, and other important public questions, has disappointed the just expectations of the great majority of the people of this Province.' " Now he, (Mr. H.) was not in

the same position as the Hon. member for Sherbrooke, (Mr. Galt) on this question²⁴, as he had not voted for a permanent Seat of Government at Quebec.²⁵ [He] was not, therefore, subject to the same animadversions which were launched at that hon. member's head by the Attorney Gen. West, whether just or unjust, for his supposed inconsistency in²⁶ supporting the motion of the hon. member for L'Assomption, because he [Mr. Galt] had voted with the majority when the Seat of Government question was determined. But although in an accidental way he had voted with the majority on that occasion, he was perfectly justifiable in supporting a motion which conveyed a censure to the Government for the failure on their part to discharge their duty as leaders of this House and consequently by becoming so embarrassed as to prevent a decision being arrived at in conformity with what everybody knows to be the wish of the country in regard to the Seat of Government. They showed their inability to control the action of this House, and the subject became so complicated that a vote was given, which would not have been given upon any other occasion.²⁷ Therefore, his hon. friend was in a position to censure the Government. But he (Mr. H.) was not in that position. He had voted against the selection of Quebec as a permanent seat of Government²⁸ — not because as a Lower Canadian he should not prefer seeing the Seat of Government fixed at Quebec rather than any other place except Montreal, which he believed to be ths [sic] proper place [sic] for it; but because he believed then, and was still of the same opinion, that any determination to fix the Seat of Government at Quebec tends to imperil this Union. He believed the country would never consent to fix the Seat of Government at either extremity, and therefore as a friend of the Union, emancipating himself from all local considerations whatever, he voted against a motion which he believed to be contrary to the interests and wishes of the country, and calculated if carried out seriously to imperil the Union. He might mention as he had not as yet spoken upon this subject, that in his opinion they were limited to a choice of three places occupying a central position in the Province — Kingston, Ottawa, and Montreal — and he believed the country at large would acquiesce in the selection of either of these three places. He was perfectly certain the people of Montreal would acquiesce in the selection of either of these three places, if a vote was fairly taken upon the subject by this House. They are only anxious that this absurd ambulatory system should be put an end to. But the motion he had submitted opened up a wider scope for remark. They were now to discuss the whole policy of the government.²⁹ The Government had chosen last night, by raising frivolous points of form, (hear, hear,) to prevent the discussion being narrowed to that single question of a seat of Government.³⁰ They are now met upon the issue which they themselves forced upon the opposition, and the opposition were now ready to enter into the history of the whole transaction of this government. He would not advert to the origin of the Government, nor to the peculiar circumstances which led to the formation of it. His opinions on that subject were well known. But whatever opinions may have existed, as to the necessity of such a combination he thought the time had gone by for a question being raised as to the fact that the mission of that coalition is ended.³¹ All difference of opinion had long ceased upon the point, whether the Government, as now constituted, was capable of grappling with the great questions of policy constantly arising, and, whether they could longer remain in their present position. (Hear, hear.) He did not stand there to censure them for their political combination³². He was willing to accord to those hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, who had hitherto supported this combination, the same credit for purity of motives — the same desire to promote the great objects for which they were elected to parliament, as he claimed to be governed by himself in his own course upon the floor of this House. He differed with them at the time because he thought the great Liberal party were quite competent to take possession of the Government of the country without imperilling its interests. These gentlemen took a different opinion and perhaps they were right, but all that has now passed and the Government has now ceased to carry on the administration for the interests of the country³³, (hear, hear,)³⁴ and it has ceased to enjoy the confidence of this House; and these gentlemen who formerly supported the administration should now endeavour to persue [sic] a course calculated to restore unity to the great Liberal party, which for causes unnecessary for him to mention, has been divided. (Hear, hear.) What has the Government done? What did they do last session? What have they done with the few comparatively paltry measure[s] they recommended

to the house in the Speech from the Throne? What has become of the famous Police Bill, on which the well-being and good order of the country depended? After a three months session it still stands at its first reading, and no man dares make even a passing allusion to it. Where are all the other measures referred to in the speech. It is true the Legislative Council Bill has been carried through this House and mutilated in the other House, whether at their connivance or suggestion he would not say. He could not recollect any other measure of [an] even tolerable degree of public importance which the Government has called this session³⁵; and if the Administration of the day were unable to inaugurate any great new question of public policy, how could they discharge their duty? The Report of the Committee on public Accounts which he (Mr. H.) had laid upon the table yesterday — (hear, hear) — would expose a degree of departmental³⁶ — he would not say corruption — but it was either corruption or imbecility³⁷, which will startle the country. (Hear, hear.)³⁸ The hon. gentleman here commenced to comment upon the evidence brought out in that report. He said he would begin with the Inspector General. That gentleman at the commencement of the session, as they would all recollect, said he did not propose making any important change in the tariff, as he thought it was sufficient to meet the demands of the country³⁹; and yet, after that declaration, the hon. gentleman came down, a month or six weeks after, with propositions calculated to unsettle the old tariff. (Hear, hear.)⁴⁰ What could be thought of a Finance Minister who had not the sagacity to know in the month of February or the beginning of March that he would require to increase the tariff six months after?⁴¹ With regard to the administration of that department of which that hon. gentleman is the head, that gentleman has the advantage of having in his department Mr. Langton — as Auditor General — a gentleman entitled to the highest respect.⁴² It had come to his notice that that able officer ... had for months pressed on the Inspector General the most urgent reforms, none of which had ever been carried out.⁴³ And what was the state of the Receiver-General's department? The evidence taken before the Committee on Public Accounts showed that the chief officer had been urging upon the Receiver-General a reform in the mode of adjusting the accounts of the Province, and without obtaining any result whatever. That officer testified that the statements as to the position of the public chest which are sent forth to the public, are all fallacious; that at no time do those statements give any definite account of it⁴⁴. It appears from his evidence ... that the Public Accounts still shewed balances which did not exist elsewhere than in the Receiver General's Book — the amounts having been reduced by drafts made by the heads of department[s] without the knowledge of the Chief Officer of Finance.⁴⁵ Yet this is allowed to go on from month to month and year to year without any step being taken to remedy the irregularity. That report would bring something to light with regard to the departments of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, the Postmaster General and the Commissioner of Public Works which will not tend much to their advantage. It appears that the Postmaster General has largely exceeded the appropriations he demanded for carrying on his department. It appears that without an order in Council, or a warrant from the Receiver General he has opened a credit in his own name in the Bank of Upper Canada, and has drawn large sums from the public funds in his own name without any account or check in the books of the Receiver General.⁴⁶ As to the Department of Public Works, facts were disclosed in the evidence taken by the Committee on Public Accounts, which, if they occurred in any other country than Canada, would send the public men who had charge of that department, to obscurity for the remainder of their lives.⁴⁷ A large number of contracts, some of them of great importance have been given out by that department, since the hon. gentlemen have been in office. The committee on public accounts called upon Mr. Begley⁴⁸ for a list of the contracts given out within the last two years by the Board of Works, without asking for tenders, without inviting competition. In reply, they received a list of some fifteen or twenty such works, given out without competition⁴⁹, some of them of comfortably small importance — others of them of very great importance. An appropriation of £15,000 had been made by the Legislature for the improvement of the harbors on Lake Huron. Surely that was a work of sufficient magnitude to invite the widest contemplation [sic], and yet the contracts for these works were given out by private bargain. An appropriation was made for the improvement of Lake Scugog navigation⁵⁰, a work of great magnitude — amounting to £25,000 or £30,000 — and to whom was it given?⁵¹

To James Rigney, one of the original contractors for Piers below Quebec, that contract having been forfeited on account of his inability to complete the work, and handed to Mr. Baby.⁵² Another work sent out in the same way was a contract for a very important road between Canada and New Brunswick, for which an appropriation was made. That work too was given to the great favorite, Mr. Baby, without any of the formalities usual on such occasions, given in fact at his own estimate. He thought he had said enough in regard to that evidence. (Go on, go on.) He called upon Mr. Begley for information in regard to an instance in which the department had increased the contract prices without inviting public competition. It would be remembered that about three years ago the Government called for tenders for the Tug Service below Quebec. At the time there were two tenders given in, one by Mr. Baby, the other by Edmonston[e] & Allen [sic], of Montreal, who, ever[y]body would admit were thoroughly competent to undertake such a work. These gentlemen proposed to perform the service, and to construct two large steamers fitted for the Gulf, in any weather.⁵³ Mr. Baby ... tendered at a somewhat lower price, but for a very inferior sort of vessels.⁵⁴ A year passed away, and it was found that Edmonston[e] & Allan were right in the ideas they [sic] had formed as to the kind of boats that would be required. The boats that Mr. Baby put on were incapable for the service. Other boats were required.⁵⁵ What then did the Board of Works do? They gave Mr. Baby a new contract⁵⁶ for ten years, at a very much higher rate of annual bonus, than that asked by other responsible parties, the Government giving Mr. Baby an annual bonus of £11,300, and agreeing also to advance him £30,000, before he proceeded to lay the keel of his first vessel; — whereas the gentlemen whose proposition was rejected had promised to furnish the vessels themselves, and to enter into a contract for a shorter time and at a much lower rate.⁵⁷ He trusted that the Commissioner of Public Works understood what he said. In view of such statements, they were entitled to ask whether these gentlemen are in a position to ask this House to vote confidence in them. Were the Government in a position to ask them to affirm their fitness to continue in their present places. There had been during this entire session daily rumors of resignation, daily intrigues, and plots and counterplots. In that delightful employment the hon. gentlemen seem to have expended all those talents with which nature had been pleased, not too prodigally he would admit, to furnish them. In the early part of the session, the Attorney General [West], the Postmaster General and the Speaker of the Legislative Council attempted to oust the leader of the Administration in order to conduct our affairs of the country with a more liberal spirit.⁵⁸ That leader had, however, what some of his colleagues lacked — strength of will⁵⁹, [and] although feeble physically he would not go out. Time floated on and one of the trio, his hon. friend the Speaker of the Legislative Council, supposing that the most perfect good faith subsisted between himself and his two colleagues, felt impelled to resign his seat. What course did his colleagues pursue? Fancying that the hon. Speaker was personally unpopular in consequence of his connexion with a certain great work, and seeing the Premier was not likely to give way, they sacrificed their late colleague, and induced one of his supporters to join the Administration, and supply the place which had become vacant by the betrayal of their colleague.⁶⁰ Then the House saw a gentleman, for whom he had certainly great personal respect, join that very Ministry which continued to sit by a breach of faith and confidence — which had betrayed that gentleman's late friend and colleague — the Hon. John Ross.⁶¹ It was now time that the House and the country should be fully informed in regard to all these transactions. He would not longer detain the House, but he trusted the result of this vote would be to place the Government of this country in the hands of a strong, united, and honest ministry — whether composed of conservatives under the leadership of his hon. friend the member for Toronto, or of Liberals from both sides of the House. He certainly would prefer a Liberal Government, but he would infinitely prefer a Conservative Government to that sort of combination we have at the present time.⁶²

(522)

And the Question on the Amendment being again proposed;

Mr. *Holton* moved in amendment to the said proposed Amendment, That the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, conveying to him the expression that the position which His Excellency's Administration have assumed up to the

present day, on the Question of the Seat of Government, does not inspire this House with the confidence necessary to entrust that Administration with the moneys required for the construction of the necessary Buildings at the Seat of Government" be left out, and the words "the course of the Administration with reference to the Question of the Seat of Government and other important Public Questions has disappointed the just expectations of the great majority of the People of this Province" inserted instead thereof;

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY replied at some length to the statements of the hon. member for Montreal. He said, as he had been freely alluded to, he craved the indulgence of offering a few remarks in defence of himself and those gentlemen associated with him. The hon. gentleman had said that he was prepared to develop certain facts which would compel the heads of departments to hide themselves in obscurity for the rest of their lives. That they had exhibited their corruption or their imbecility — a sort of dilemma, he imagined, of either horn of which they might take their choice. He has brought a charge against the members of the government of the mismanagement of the public accounts. He has endeavored to show that the balances there given are fallacious, and that the Deputy Receiver General had pointed these out, but the head of the department had failed to correct them. The hon. Inspector General here went over the various charges which had been made by the hon. member in support of his amendment. In reference to the contract to Mr. Baby for the tug service, he stated that⁶³ Mr. Baby had obtained the contract at the lowest tender. When it was found that his boats were not of a desirable class, the government were already bound to them, and they could not change the contract without his consent.⁶⁴ When the new contract was made for the large boats, a rate of charge was agreed upon by Mr. Baby, and the Board of Works submitted this list to Edmonston[e] & Allan, and they said they would not take the contract upon the same terms. Mr. Allan stated in his (Mr. Cayley's) presence⁶⁵ that the contract with Mr. Baby was at a lower rate than he would have taken it at himself, for the same class of vessels. In reference to the charge against the Postmaster General, of having drawn from the bank, £33,000, without any order from the Receiver General,⁶⁶ he read from the Report of the Committee of Public Accounts of 1854, the evidence given by Mr. Ridout; thus showing that the Postmaster General's Department had been, at a period prior to the taking office by the present government, indebted to the banks, and that the system now considered bad had not been [i]nstituted by the present Postmaster General⁶⁷ [but] by the Hon. Mr. Hincks — the friend of the hon. g[e]ntleman who was now denouncing the system. It was clear that the system found its origin — not in the imbecility — but in the great financial powers of hon. gentlemen opposite.⁶⁸ In the report of the public accounts committee, it was charged against the Government that they had drawn from the bank in such a way, that the real balance at their credit was not nearly so great as it seemed to be. The same system of issuing board of works' certificates was in operation before the present Government was in existence⁶⁹. In support of this, he read again from the Report of the Committee of Public Accounts in 1854. It was in his opinion, the most extraordinary thing, that the gentleman now the Chairman of the Committee who had made this report, was the very one who, when at the head of the Board of Works had introduced the system complained of.⁷⁰ This fact, he believed, was established by the evidence of Mr. Begley. The committee said they had derived great assistance from the auditor, Mr. Langton.⁷¹ In regard to Mr. Langton urging reforms — he (Mr. Cayley) stated that it was in consequence of the irregular mode in which these public accounts had been kept for years past that the present administration brought in a bill to establish a new branch in the Inspector General's department, in order that a more thorough, full, and searching examination of the accounts might be made. They selected this gentleman — who had been so highly spoken of — that the evil might be remedied for the future. It was rather strange he considered that any charge should be made against the administration in connexion with Mr. Langton's department. They stood there charged with imbecility and corruption in the face of all that they had done for the purpose of bringing about these reforms.⁷² Were they to be blamed for those irregularities in departmental management, which the Government, through Mr. Langton, had brought to light? He denied that either he or any of his colleagues

had been unwilling to undertake the reforms suggested by Mr. Langton.⁷³ Had he been before the Committee, he could have proved that he had spent much time in listening to the suggestions of Mr. Langton, and in attempting to reform admitted irregularities.⁷⁴ The hon. member for Montreal charged him with want of foresight in having stated in reply to a question he put at the beginning of the session, that he had no intention of raising the tariff. His answer was that he could not foresee those Grand Trunk difficulties, of which he believed that that hon. member and his hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Galt) were at that time aware.⁷⁵ And at the time when these great financiers were acquainted with the embarrassments of the country, they were themselves trying to get all the revenues of the Canals into their own hands, and to oppress the trade of the country by monopolising all the channels of navigation.⁷⁶ He did not admit the truth of one of the charges brought by the hon. member [Mr. Holton]. The Government were gradually improving the system of public accounts. He did think the hon. member's allusion to ministerial plottings and crises, did not come well from a member, whose conduct had been such as it had been last session in regard to the late Inspector General. They had seen one hon. gentleman assuming ... on the committee⁷⁷ the several offices of accuser, prosecutor, and judge,⁷⁸ and not content with that, joining the member for Montreal to perform the office of spy, and together to heap on the head of the late Inspector General a column of calumny.⁷⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER called the Inspector General to order. The language in which he was attacking members of this house was not such as might be expected from ministers of the Crown. (Loud cries of hear, hear.)⁸⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY went on to attack Mr. Holton for his conduct on the corruption committee last session⁸¹. What took place then? Why, that the bosom friend of Mr. Hincks, the member for Montreal, had plotted against him week after week to drive him from the country. As to himself, he repudiated the charges of plotting against the Hon. John Ross, and thought, if the charge of plotting was to be brought against any one, it was against members opposite, who day by day had been bringing forward charges of incapacity and corruption against others. All however, tending to shew so much that they only were the men to govern the country, notwithstanding the foregoing motions.⁸² [He] accuse[d] the opposition of a rancorous feeling, occasioned by their disappointment at not having been able to establish any charge against the Government⁸³. He was sure the charges were made, not because gentlemen opposite believed there was one particle of truth in them; but simply in order to embarrass the Government.⁸⁴ Last night, when the question raised by the amendment was proposed to the House, and the ministry were most anxious for decision, they were met by a motion for adjournment. It was only because the government refused to be bought or to buy, that they were liable to the charge of having no policy. They had indeed succeeded in every measure of importance which they had laid before the House in the brief space of a year and half, they had carried the Seigniorial Tenure Bill and the Clergy Reserves Bill, measures as important as some which had furnished occupation for the life times of English Statesmen. As to the immediate subject before the House, it had always been an open question; and when the House had voted that permanent buildings should be erected at Quebec, the Government had nothing to do but to carry out that determination.⁸⁵ They had brought down the sum of £50,000 in the estimates, because an annual appropriation of that amount would be sufficient. Even had they brought down an appropriation of £300,000, they would have been unable to expend that amount in one year⁸⁶, [and] the opposition would have been equally disposed to blame their course. He believed in his conscience that the ministry could stand up before the house and the country, as clear and innocent from charges of corruption as any set of men that ever occupied a like position.⁸⁷

MR. LARWILL thought it would be better to take the vote without any more discussion, because it was only [a] waste of time. It would be better to vote at once than give an opportunity to speak long and say nothing⁸⁸, as no new idea was likely to occur to any gentleman about the position or abilities of the ministry.⁸⁹

[The House then adjourned for the recess.]

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ... [took] the chair shortly before 8 o'clock⁹⁰.

MR. CHABOT defended the course taken by the Government, in bringing down a vote for an appropriation of £50,000 for public buildings at Quebec.⁹¹ [He] imputed the failure to transact business on the part of the Government to the conduct of the opposition, in renewing constantly idle discussion, and declared that if the Ministry were feeble, the greater babblings of the opposition had been manifested by their conduct, in respect to the amendment they now propose, which they had struggled long on the preceding night to put into a form that would come within the rules of the House. After ridiculing the amendment as proposed by Mr. Papin,⁹² [he said] he did not think the charge of the member for Montreal just, when he said the Government had not carried through any important measures. Had they not passed measures for settling the Clergy Reserves and Seignorial Tenure, and making the Legislative Council Elective?⁹³ He was not one of those who would now say, you have done all we want and have the goodness to leave your seats. The Opposition was a factious one, divided among themselves in opinion, yet always voting together; and, therefore, more slaves to party than the Ministry.⁹⁴ As to the charge against the Board of Works, in reference to the Baby contract for the piers below Quebec, for which Parliament had voted £40,000, and £170,000 was spent,⁹⁵ that had been discussed at Quebec for fifteen days, and⁹⁶ he considered that Parliament had sustained the course of the government in that matter, by confirming the additional expenditure and voting the necessary amount⁹⁷; yet in that great fact was found the great news of the day — a wonderful marvel.⁹⁸ If the present motion should carry, he did not think the opposition were able to form a government to replace that now in office.⁹⁹ Opposition was no doubt good; but he objected to a mere personal opposition such as that of the present day in Canada, and such as had existed formerly in France under Louis Philippe.¹⁰⁰ The hon. member proceeded to read from a French work, an account of the opposition in the French Chambers, previous to the revolution of 1848, whose factiousness and incapacity he considered had a parallel in the opposition to the present government.¹⁰¹

MR. GALT rose to support the motion submitted by the member for Montreal.¹⁰² He did not consider now to make any reference to the Seat of Government question, but would merely remark that the proper time for hon. gentlemen opposite to accuse him of inconsistency in that or any other great public question, would be when by his vote or his arguments he had displayed such inconsistency. And this, he would maintain, had not been his conduct on the occasion referred to. Before proceeding to discuss the question before the House he would say that he had listened with great surprise to the remarks of the hon. Inspector General, that evening. That hon. gentleman's remarks were made in a spirit and style widely different from those he was accustomed to make in that House; and he (Mr. Galt) could only attribute the hon. gentleman's total loss of temper on that occasion, to the truthfulness of the observations of the hon. member for Montreal which had evidently distressed the hon. Inspector General exceedingly.¹⁰³ (Hear, hear.)¹⁰⁴ The gentleman had improperly taken a political censure for a personal attack, and he had thus been led into remarks perfectly unjustifiable. Heretofore, that gentleman had honorably distinguished himself from his colleagues by his ability to keep his temper. He thought it would be better if he had maintained that distinction, for it could not be forgotten how frequently, as upon the occasion when it was found necessary to appoint a Committee to enquire into the conduct of the member for Lambton in the Penitentiary Commission, the Speaker had been obliged to call members of the administration to order for gross personal attacks.¹⁰⁵ (Hear, hear.)¹⁰⁶ The opposition, he thought had not so conducted themselves, except, perhaps, when they have been provoked by conduct which human nature could not bear.¹⁰⁷ Now he (Mr. Galt) claimed the right of attacking the Government, with all the strength of which he was possessed; and he would say that it was not fair [if] in the exercise of that right, any hon. gentleman should be subjected to such a distempered attack as had been just made

by the hon. Inspector General. In reference to the gross personal attack that hon. gentleman had made on the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton,) ¹⁰⁸ though the member for Montreal might not consider it necessary to repel the attack made upon him, he (Mr. G.) considered it necessary to allude to the facts on which that attack was founded. ¹⁰⁹ The Inspector General represented that in the Corruption Committee the hon. member for Montreal had pursued a system of espionage, that while representing himself, and being ostensibly the friend of Mr. Hincks, who was on trial before the committee, he was plotting for weeks and weeks against them [sic]. Now, he would most distinctly state before that House that that statement was utterly groundless. Two years before that committee sat, it was well known that the hon. member for Montreal was in opposition to Mr. Hincks. ¹¹⁰

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER. — I deny that. ¹¹¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER called the Provincial Secretary to order. ¹¹²

MR. GALT said the Provincial Secretary might deny the fact; but unfortunately for the denial, there were many hon. gentlemen in that house able to prove its incorrectness — there were too many hon. gentlemen in that house well aware that during the period alluded to, there was most decided antagonism ¹¹³ [and] a complete estrangement between Mr. Holton and Mr. Hincks, so that the gross charge of espionage brought against Mr. Holton had no foundation in fact. A memorandum relating to certain transaction[s] was made by Mr. Holton, very long before the proceedings of the corruption committee, and handed to Mr. Young, and th[r]ough Mr. Young passed into the hands of the member for Lambton. ¹¹⁴ [That memorandum] of his hon. friend's objections to Mr. Hinck[s]'s policy, was subsequently produced before the committee, [but] he (Mr. Galt) would say that it had been done without the knowledge or consent of his friend from Montreal. ¹¹⁵ [It] had, in fact, been entirely forgotten by the member for Montreal, who had in the meantime renewed his relations of personal friendship with Mr. Hincks ¹¹⁶, which was now as warm as ever it was. ¹¹⁷ It was, therefore, utterly untrue that the member for Montreal had plotted against the Inspector General, under the guise of friendship, and in fact that gentleman had taken no part whatever in the prosecution of the charges before the committee. He made this statement because it was one thing to oppose a person with whom the member for Montreal was in antagonism, and another to make attacks upon a person for whom he was at the same time professing friendship. The best proof that there was nothing dishonorable in the conduct of that gentleman, was that it had neither interrupted the friendship between him and Mr. Hincks, who might surely have been allowed to judge of the conduct of a friend towards himself. Such charges as this, on the part of the Inspector General, were shameful. Besides, the Inspector General seemed quite to forget that [sic] relations of himself and one of his colleagues towards the late Inspector General, who they had once censured in the most violent language, and whose policy they had, nevertheless, afterwards undertaken to carry out. ¹¹⁸ [OR] The relations of the Attorney General West to Hon. Mr. Hincks were of a much more doubtful character — that gentleman having denounced the government of Mr. Hincks as steeped to the lips in corruption, and having shortly afterwards undertaken to carry out the policy of that government. He did not think the Inspector General's vindication of Mr. Baby's contract for the tug service would at all satisfy the House. ¹¹⁹ He stated that the Government accepted Baby's tender because it was the lowest. He (Mr. Galt) presumed the hon. gentleman meant the previous Government. That Government subsequently found that the terms of this contract were not such as to enable the contractor to fulfil his engagement, and they therefore entered into a fresh contract, increasing the grant. Now, he would state that that contract for this service had been handed over to Mr. Baby without a fair competition being allowed for the work; and that statement was fully borne out by the remarks of the hon. Inspector General. This tug-boat service was originally let for a term of two years at £11,000 per annum, and the total amount of service performed for this immense sum was the towing of some 20 or 30 ships. Now, however, this contract had been entered into for a term of 10 years, at the expense, probably, of some £20,000 annually; and were the

houses [sic] to judge from the report then before them, they should come to the conclusion that no such amount was needed. With reference to the change [sic] contained in the report of the Board of Works, that large contracts had been entered into by the Government without any public tender, the Inspector General did not attempt to deny or offer any excuse for the principle. He did not believe any member of the Government could rise in his place to defend such a system. It was, too, a question from which the Government could not shield themselves by any act of their predecessors. It appeared to him that the whole defence set up by the hon. Inspector General was that it was true the system was indefensible; but the present Government was not to blame. All the mischief was done by their predecessors. These luckless individuals were in a certain sense guilty of all sorts of misdemeanors. The present administration had done no worse; and therefore they were not to be blamed. Now, in reply to this, he would merely say that¹²⁰ whatever might have been the practice of their predecessors, the present Government were clearly responsible for the system which they themselves pursued. When they took office, the country was given to understand that they would pursue a less corrupt and more honest system. Instead of this expectation being fulfilled, the management of the public departments was worse than it ever had been before.¹²¹ In 1854 the Committee on Public Accounts, found a large balance unaccounted for, in the Inspector General's department. In 1856, that amount had swelled to £30,000. That was the way in which those hon. gentlemen carried out their reformation.¹²² The Inspector General had accused the member for Montreal [Mr. Young], not then present, of being the author of the system complained of. In the absence of that gentleman, of course no one could deny that statement, but¹²³ from the earnest desire always manifested by Mr. Young to reform abuses in departmental management, he could scarcely give credence to the statement. The Inspector General claimed credit for the Audit Bill, and the appointment of [the] Auditor.¹²⁴ Now, he (Mr. Galt) would say that neither the Inspector General nor the Government were entitled to that amount of credit, for this measure, to which they laid claim. So far from the bill being a Government measure, it arose from the disclosures made by the Committee on Public Accounts in 1854,¹²⁵ which had excited the indignation of the country, and forced the audit bill upon the Administration.¹²⁶ Therefore the committee on Public Accounts or their able and efficient chairman, Mr. Mackenzie, were entitled to all the credit of the measure¹²⁷; and one important feature of the Audit Bill was taken from the Bill of the member for Chambly (Mr. Darche).¹²⁸ As a measure of reform, however the appointment of Mr. Langton would be a long time bringing about any reform. There were some other points to which he would like to have made allusion, had the hon. Inspector General been in his place.¹²⁹

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER. — Go on; I will tell him when he comes in.¹³⁰

MR. GALT said that the matter to which he had reference was the extraordinary mistake of the Inspector General in always confounding the hon. member from Montreal and himself (Mr. Galt). It was very strange the Inspector General should be guilty of such a confusion of persons; and he hoped the hon. Provincial Secretary would use his influence to prevent the repetition of the mistake. The hon. gentleman then went on to say that the Inspector General also claimed credit for the Government for the Clergy Reserves Bill, Seigniorial Tenure Bill, and Legislative Council Bill; and they were welcome to all the credit of such measures. It was not at all probable the credit would burden them. (Hear, hear.)¹³¹ Were they not forced upon them by the country, after they had been opposing these measures all their lives? The one thing for which they deserved credit was that sacrifice of personal feeling, perhaps he might say of political principle, which, according to the Post Master General had been made on the altar of the country, a sacrifice not entirely without compensation in the shape of political power which had been held ever since.¹³² But there were other measures which peculiarly belonged to the present ministry, and for which they were entitled to all the credit such measures could confer. Why did not the Inspector General take credit for the Militia Bill of last Session? That measure peculiarly belonged to the present administration. And this session they had furnished another of those peculiar measures in the shape of

a Police Bill — a measure which had been repudiated from one end of the Province to the other, and which was not the Bill they were led to expect.¹³³ Mr. Galt then referred to the estimates for the year, brought down by the Inspector General, amounting altogether to about a million and a half of pounds.¹³⁴ He did not wish to reply to the Inspector General in his own offensive manner, but¹³⁵ he would say that there was a total absence of any large statesmanlike views in the administration of the country's finances. If he looked at the estimates, he found them in a confused state — and many of the supplies voted were such as that house never could approve of. The Inspector General himself seemed to think some of them unnecessary, and he doubted that hon. gentleman would find many of the others equally so.¹³⁶ He would like to ask whether in the supplemental estimates, in which large sums were set down for public works, there was any indication whatever of any scheme that would tend to make public works profitable?¹³⁷ Their whole course was to destroy the commerce which we desired to see pass through our own waters.¹³⁸ The Inspector General as usual alluded to the Caughnawaga canal, and seemed to think it was a subject on which he (Mr. G.) and his friend the member for Montreal were very open to attack, because they were ready to stake all they had in the world in carrying out a great public improvement as they at least considered [it].¹³⁹ Now, he for one was not at all disposed to shrink from his responsibility in relation to that work. And neither was his hon. friend. By the Board of Works' reports he found that the last four sets of Commissioners appointed had reported in favor of that work. Now, what he condemn[ed] the Inspector General for, was that while the work had been reported on so favorably, the Inspector General would neither take the work in hand nor allow others to do so. He (Mr. Galt) was willing to go on with the work solely on receipt of the tolls; but he had been refused on the grounds that it would be taking too much revenue from the Province.¹⁴⁰ The Inspector General spoke of the desire of himself [Mr. Galt] and Mr. Young to possess themselves of the revenues of the canals. But if the Inspector General really thought that it would be a profitable scheme for private individuals to complete this new canal, merely for the sake of the revenues of the canal which now produced nothing, then, he thought, it was his duty to secure that profit for the benefit of the country.¹⁴¹ Under all the circumstances he thought the vote of want of confidence ought to prevail. The ministry were utterly bankrupt in measures.¹⁴² The only measures for which they had received any credit, had been left them as a legacy, and taken up by them against their will.... Of the measures which the government had brought up, of their own, *in proprio motu*, not one had met the approbation of the country.¹⁴³

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER. — The Education Bill, for instance.¹⁴⁴

MR. GALT. — The solitary measure which had been approved of, was not theirs, but belonged to the Committee on Public Accounts. When he saw such a barren Administration at the head of the affairs of that Province for eighteen months — the most prominent characteristic of their rule, being the grossest mismanagement — their sole defence being that they only followed the bad example of their predecessors — that the Auditor of the Public Accounts had not time to report yet — or some such frivolous excuse — when they saw one and all resigning themselves to a policy which had hurled the previous Administration from power — and that there was no reasonable hope of their improvement — then there was but one course for that House to pursue, and that was by adopting the amendment before the House, declare that such a Ministry had lost all confidence and respect. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁵

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX complained that the acts of his department were blamed, without any appreciation being attempted of the real facts. For instance, the Government were attacked for the tug-boats; but they had been under contract to Mr. Baby, and could not escape from it without paying that gentleman damages. It was much better to do what was done — to have good vessels, and make them go much lower down than they were bound to do by the original contract. Besides, the house had already justified the Government on that ground last session. The towing of vessels had been much greater the last season than the season previous, and it would probably augment again in the present

year. Great praise was given to Mr. Langton for his discoveries; but Mr. Langton could have discovered nothing without the assistance of the Heads of Departments. It had also been alleged that contracts had been given without advertisements for tenders. Well, that was not concealed. The Department had made everything public in order to obtain all possible suggestions for improvement. But it was not true, as alleged, that there had been any favouritism in giving out those works. The works on Lake Huron had been given to Mr. Brown, because he was the only person capable of doing them, and they were given at the same rates as had been paid by the Northern Railway for similar works on the Georgian Bay, which were not so difficult. It was also complained that the works on the Scugog had been given out in the same manner. Though Mr. Rigney had been unfortunate in his contract below Quebec, nevertheless, he was perfectly competent, and he had fulfilled his contract on the Scugog in an admirable manner. He then proceeded to justify the giving of the contract of the Canada and New Brunswick Road to Mr. Baby, saying that that gentleman had undertaken to do the work at a price below the estimates of the engineers — and this Mr. Baby had done not for profit, but to fulfil engagements he had already entered into with workmen, before the rate of wages had risen.¹⁴⁶ [He] concluded by expressing an opinion, that to turn out the present government would not endow the country with a better one.¹⁴⁷

MR. PATRICK would like to do all he could for his friends in the Government, in their present trying position.¹⁴⁸

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER. — Of course.¹⁴⁹

MR. PATRICK was afraid, however, that he could not help them much. He considered the amendment now before the chair an improvement on the motion of the hon. member for L'Assomption. It was, he considered, sufficient to convince the Government of their unjustifiable course with regard to the proposal made for the erection of permanent Government buildings at Quebec. Hon. gentlemen in the Government were too shrewd to think for one moment that the House was sincere in voting Quebec as the permanent seat of Government. How was that vote accomplished? By three classes of persons uniting their efforts for different purposes. Of course, as to the members who resided in Quebec and thereabouts, it was natural that they should vote for that place being the permanent seat, and they would do so in all sincerity; but there was another class which united with them, who could not have intended that the money of the Province should be expended for erecting permanent buildings for that purpose. It was those who were in favor of the present system of perambulation. (Hear, hear.) And in order to make the matter as ridiculous as possible, and one against which the mind of any honest man would revolt, they resolved to fix it permanently at Quebec. There was another class, namely, those who were anxious that a disruption should take place — that the present Union should be dissolved. They too voted for Quebec, and with the efforts of these three different parties, the question was carried in its favor. Now, the Government ought to have known that that being the position of matters — and they were two [sic] shrewd not to know it — tha[t] they were not justified in making the appropriation which they had proposed to the House, and which was carried. He thought the Government had lost the confidence of the House, and he was sure they had lost that of the country. He was confident they had lost the confidence of Upper Canada. Nobody could doubt that. (Hear, hear.) If they would take the money raised in Upper Canada to erect permanent buildings in Lower Canada, that was certainly sufficient to withdraw from the Government the confidence of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) It had been said with propriety that the Militia Bill was another measure upon which they had lost the confidence of the country. The Government came down and asked for £60,000 to support a few idle men in the army — dubbed “militia officers” — when the country no more needed such a force than a waggon needed five wheels; and this measure was forced on them, too, when they were expecting large reinforcements of British troops¹⁵⁰ to arrive shortly from the Crimea. (Hear, hear.)¹⁵¹ The Police Bill was another case. It was apparent that that Bill was not wanted. All the municipalities had declared against it. It had been weighed in the

balance and found wanting. With regard to matters of retrenchment, the Government had pursued a course the very opposite of that which was so justly looked for from them. Their Railway policy laid them open to the same remark, as also their conduct with reference to the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Morrison,) whom they permitted to occupy a seat on the Treasury benches, without obliging him to go back to his constituents for approval. In their refusing to allow another census to be taken, in order to ascertain what is the position of the two Provinces in population, so that representation might be based upon population, they had thwarted the wishes of the country. (Hear, hear.) And if ever a Government had pursued a disgraceful course, it was with regard to the appointment of Mr. Langton to be Auditor-General. They had appointed him to that position, solely because they found him too much in their way. (Hear, hear.) He had been found too much of an obstructive; therefore, he was removed, and they placed a more subservient person in his place. Instead [sic] of deserving credit for such an act, they deserved execration. (Laughter.) As to the Inspector General's eulogium upon Mr. Hincks, it was by the Government circulating all sorts of reports about that gentleman in order to build up their own popularity, that they had placed themselves where they were; and they had not long been settled ere they took him to their bosoms, and hugged him as their friend. Such eulogium upon the part of the Inspector General, ill became him. He (Mr. P.) was satisfied that the vote, at least, from Upper Canadian members, would show that the Government had lost their confidence, as well as that of the country.¹⁵²

MR. RANKIN thought it the duty of members of that House, above all things, to maintain their self-respect. The question before the House now came up in a manner much more consonant with his views of the proper mode of proceeding than any preceding motion of the same sort. It had been alleged that several votes of confidence had been recently given to Ministers. He denied this. The previous votes in favor of Ministers had been given on the abstract merits of the questions raised, — not in order to maintain them in their position.¹⁵³ No fair vote had yet been taken on a simple question of confidence. And certainly they were not entitled to the confidence either of the house or the country.¹⁵⁴ As he had not supported them on many occasions he felt it necessary to review¹⁵⁵ the policy and measures of the administration from the period of their advent to power, down to the present. Forty-eight hours before they held office the desks of the hon. gentlemen now on the Ministerial benches, were strewn with amendments to the Address from the throne; and the very first thing they did on their advent to power, was to recommend thier [sic] followers to sustain that address. And accordingly those hon. gentlemen swallowed up the Address, burned their amendments, and carried it in spite of all opposition. Did that entitle them to the confidence of the house? The next Act for which he censured them was the Clergy Reserves Act. Then followed the Seigniorial Tenure Bill. He understood the trick in the Clergy Reserves Bill and voted against it. He did not so well understand the Seigniorial Tenure Bill, and in the first instance he voted for it, the Attorney General East having persuaded him that it was as near perfection as human intellect was capable of bringing it. But when it came back from the Upper House, it was so altered that even its father could scarcely recognize it. And yet the Attorney General took it as an adopted child, and forced it through the House. On the Seat of Government question, the Government professed to leave it an open question, which showed either that they were lamentably ignorant of the geography of their country, or that they had not the courage to do what they knew they ought to do, and to encounter the opposition which their taking the right course would excite against them. It proved either that they were incompetent or that they were unpatriotic. A set of school-boys diverting themselves between school hours, could not pursue a course more ridiculous than had been taken by the Government on this question. And yet they had the audacity to ask the house to vote confidence in them. The next question was that of the tariff. Shortly after his entering office the Inspector General thought it would conduce to his popularity, if he could reduce the tariff. He had heard the present Governor of Barbadoes remark that, while he supported the present Government, because they suited his convenience, he considered it an unwise policy in his successors to reduce the tariff. But the excessive desire of the Inspector General and his colleagues [sic] to catch a little popular applause, induced them to make a reduction. What was the consequence? But

one year had pass[ed] by and they found the same hon. gentleman coming down to the house and asking an increase of 25 per cent.! thus showing their utter want of foresight and knowledge of the circumstances of the country. On the Main[e] Liquor Law question, also, although it deeply affected the revenue and the social state of the people, the Government had not the unanimity or boldness to take a firm stand on it. But after a great deal of time had been wasted in useless discussion, they killed off that law by a trick, which savored more of low cunning than of statesmanship. The hon. member then referred to the Grand Trunk scheme, which was at present at a stand still, for the want of some decided policy on the part of the Government. They had given no inkling of their intentions, and the only thing that the country knew of it, was what a paper in this City had published, under the irreverent title of the "Cayley Omnibus." (Laughter.) Then in their administrative policy, they had pursued a course which forfeited their right to any confidence the people might ever have reposed in them. He charged them with pursuing a most tyrannical course, in tee [sic] dismissal of an important functionary in the county he had the honor to represent, without giving him an opportunity of refuting any charges made against him. The gentleman to whom he alluded was dismissed in the harshest manner, without an opportunity of entering upon his defence. There were three candidates for the vacant office, all of whom had been supporters of his own at the last election. One of those candidates received the recommendation of almost every one in that and the adjoining counties, qualified to judge. There was another, whom he did not consider so well qualified. He was asked to support that gentleman, and an attempt was made to bribe him for his support, the offer of the disposal of a newspaper being made to him, if he would give that gentleman his support. (Hear, hear.) He refused to support him, but that gentleman was an old schoolfellow, and probably a relative of a member of the government, and received the appointment. (Hear, hear.) A government ought to show that they were competent to deal with the questions which agitated the country, and they ought to be faithful to each other. But that character the present Administration did not possess. Their chief aim seemed to be how they might shirk every question of the least importance, and shuffle through the session. (Hear, hear.) Was there a man in this House desiring to be considered patriotic by the people, who would rise in his place and deliberately say, that he respected the present Administration, and looked upon them as possessed of ability and integrity to conduct the affairs of the country in such a way as to meet the reasonable wishes of the people? He scar[c]ely believed there was a member of the house who would deliberately rise, and calmly and quietly make such a statement. If there was, all he could say was that he commiserated his miserable condition. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)¹⁵⁶

MR. MARCHILDON spoke against the amendments before the House. He was surprised that Mr. Papin should have introduced such an amendment after voting for the permanent seat of government. The gentlemen on the Opposition benches should be the last men to reproach the government for their conduct in the Grand Trunk Railway matter. They who had votod [sic] for the granting of £900,000 to that company could attack the government with but bad grace.¹⁵⁷

MR. BELLINGHAM did not see how the Government deserved a vote of want of confidence, when they were merely carrying out the express wishes of the house, in coming down with the £50,000 estimate for the erection of parliamentary buildings in Quebec.¹⁵⁸ [He] could not assent to the statements of the honourable members for Grenville and Essex, of the extravagant expenditure of public money in Lower Canada to the disadvantage of Upper Canada. The member for Grenville had drawn a very brilliant picture of Upper Canada, and it has undoubtedly been very much favored by nature; but Lower Canada also had its advantages — it has superabundant water power which may profitably be employed in manufactures, and it has soil enough to feed the population engaged in manufactures.¹⁵⁹ Lower Canada required to be protected in such works, and he did not entirely approve of the conduct of the Governme[n]t in that respect, particularly as to the Rideau Canal. They were much to be censured for that.¹⁶⁰ [OR] He could not approve of all the acts of the government, and none of them more than in permitting three locks to remain on the Grenville canal, which had destroyed an immense tract of fertile land.

Gentlemen who attack the Government for consenting to open the region of the Ottawa by railway forget that that railway will pass through 300 miles of Upper Canada, so that it may be said to be in reality an Upper Canadian project. The treasure of the country is being wasted on a railway which will destroy the canals. In order to succeed, it should pass through the interior of the country, and not along the river bank; but the government is not chargeable with having originated that scheme, it is an unfortunate legacy which has come to them from their predecessors. And here he would say that he has now come fresh from public opinion, and he is satisfied that the people of Canada will demand the impeachment of the government if they consent to give¹⁶¹ another sixpence of the public money to the Grand Trunk Railway. Their feeling was that the parties who had undertaken that work should go on and carry it out.¹⁶² Let the contractors finish their work so far as they can, and then if it be necessary let them come here and demand assistance, but not before.¹⁶³ The abuses in the public departments were, he contended, universal. As an instance where Canada had been victimized, he would refer to the Beauharnois Canal, and the construction of piers below Quebec. It was quite true some system should be adopted to relieve the country from such mismanagement.¹⁶⁴ But he would not feel justified in declaring a want of confidence upon the present question before the house.¹⁶⁵ The whole question is whether the £50,000 shall be withheld from the ministry for putting up the Parliament buildings in Quebec, and regarding this question as one between Upper and Lower Canada he would go with the ministry on this occasion, for he felt that Lower Canada has not had its share of the public money.¹⁶⁶

MR. MACKENZIE here rose and produced a long strip of paper upon which appeared black circles illustrating the positions of each of the cities proposed for the Seat of Government. He proceeded to point out, in a very humorous manner, their relative distances from each other, and those of Upper Canada especially from Quebec. He said, there were only 160,000 people below Quebec and 2,400,000 above it; and was it probable that the latter, paying two-thirds of the Revenue, would willingly go down to such a cold, wintry place, where civilization stood upon so low a footing, as compared to Upper Canada. — What was the reason for going to Quebec?¹⁶⁷ In 1843, Montreal had been recommended as a suitable site for the Seat of Government. Quebec [at] that ... time was decided to be utterly unfitted for the position. He read from the journals of that day shewing that Sir Louis Lafontaine had strongly opposed the selection of Quebec as a permanent site. If the Seat of Government were taken to Quebec, the people of Upper Canada would not submit to it, and the Union could not [be] maintained. Pollett Thompson [sic] had fixed the Seat of Government at Kingston, and there was great wisdom in the choice. The Government of that day, too, had had a policy upon the subject, and the Government now should have a policy too. Mr. Baldwin had united with others to sacrifice Upper Canada by taking the Seat of Government to Montreal;¹⁶⁸ but then they alleged some reasons for it. They were able to say that Montreal was a great commercial city under the restrictive system which then existed.¹⁶⁹ Again in 1849 the Government had a policy upon the subject. That policy they maintained in 1851, when the Government was removed to the question. Why had the Government no policy now? The members of the Government should have maintained the condition of the Union and kept the Seat of Government in Upper Canada.¹⁷⁰ The member for Essex had spoken of a federal union.¹⁷¹ A Federal Union! What connexion had the 2,400,000 inhabitants of this Province with people more distant from them than the Carolinas, or New Orleans?¹⁷² The project is a mockery. We have no intercourse, no communication whatever with the people of the Lower Province; and if the 2,000,000 west of Quebec are required to go down to that place as a seat of Government, they may perhaps think whether it is not more advisable to go to Washington. He is not in favor of annexation; when he returned from the United States he had written dozens of papers against it¹⁷³, but he had told the people their only alternative was a good and honest Government. This Government was neither the one nor the other.¹⁷⁴ But he is satisfied that the only two forms of political existence open to this country are union with Britain, or annexation to the United States. Vast numbers of persons will go where the capital is; but will those persons go to Quebec? They might go to Montreal, but certainly not to Quebec.¹⁷⁵ Every day Quebec, or any Lower Canadian city was becoming less fitted for being the capital of Canada.

The Reciprocity Treaty and other causes was [sic] diverting the trade from the St. Lawrence.¹⁷⁶ He was of opinion that the little towns of Brantford and Paris contributed more to the postal revenue of the Province than the whole country below Quebec. If Upper Canada paid five sixths of the revenue, it was a proof that it had the large majority of the people, and was entitled to the Seat of Government. The Postmaster General went for Quebec, because it had fortifications. Oh, dear! How afraid he [Mr. Mackenzie] was [that] in the county he represented, under the present system,¹⁷⁷ he could not get even a magistrate appointed, unless he would consent to nominate persons at the direction of the Government.¹⁷⁸ This profligate government will give millions to be spent below Quebec, even now; while he cannot get one single dollar of the public money for that large county¹⁷⁹ which contributed so much to the revenue. Nor did he expect a dollar for it, so long as the present unprincipled, unscrupulous Government was in office.¹⁸⁰ He alluded to the conduct of Upper Canadians in sacrificing the interests of their country for the sake of office¹⁸¹. He could give the gentlemen from Lower Canada one credit, that they were always true to each other. When the Government was leaving Kingston, [they] voted as one man for going to Lower Canada, and it was gentlemen from Upper Canada who turned the scale. Perhaps this vote of £50,000 to Quebec was only a deception, like the £50,000 vote some time ago for public buildings at Toronto, not the first shilling of which had been spent. If that was the case, he abhorred the meanness of the Government still more than if they really intended to go to Quebec. He would rather deal with the bold open villain, than the low sneaking scoundrel. (Hear, hear.)¹⁸² Parliament has been eleven years in Lower Canada, and only four years in Upper Canada — and these too, in spite of the condition of the Union.¹⁸³ He admits that there ought to be a permanent seat of Government. No person who looks at the valuable property in the Parliament buildings and the departments, can doubt that there should be a permanent seat; but is Quebec the place?¹⁸⁴ He would be willing to vote for Kingston, but not for Quebec, the most remote and coldest place in Canada.¹⁸⁵

MR. BROWN rose to address the house.... He said — Mr. Speaker, I have delayed rising until now, in the full expectation that we should have heard from the hon. gentlemen opposite some attempt at explanation, however weak, of the very damaging statements which have been made by hon. members on this side, and which, I think, every one but themselves, must feel demanded some answer at their hands. It appears, however, that we are about to go to a division without any explanation of those statements; and before we proceed to a vote, I desire to state one or two reasons why I think the time has come when this house should declare that it has no longer any confidence in hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches. I am sure there is not one gentleman here from Upper Canada, who, if he were to rise now and declare, — not what are the party obligations influencing him, not what are the party, or personal, or local objects guiding him for the moment, — but what are his own sincere convictions, and the earnest convictions of his constituents, who would not tell us that public confidence in the present Administration, has entirely departed, and that the great interests of the country are suffering by those hon. gentlemen continuing to hold office. (Hear, hear.) And I think the speeches we have heard to-night are an unerring index to the public estimate of the Coalition Government. Who are the gentlemen who have occupied the floor to-night and denounced the Administration? Why the very members who, only a short time ago were sustaining the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, and who would have been sustaining them still had they not pursued a course which has entirely forfeited their confidence! In the debate on the Address, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Speech from the Throne, I took the ground which I have often taken since 1851, when we had the system of Coalition first introduced, that it was impossible for any Coalition Government to carry out an honest, straight-forward, manly policy, such as would give confidence to the whole country; but that their course must necessarily be a wavering one, and one which no party could long sustain. (Hear, hear.) It is quite clear that every Coalition, from its very commencement contains within itself the elements of division and an early dissolution. And I think it has now been shewn, by the Coalition experiments which have been made, that it is impossible that any Coalition Government can be carried on in this country, with satisfaction either to this House or to the people at large. (Hear, hear.)

The Inspector General in his speech claimed that this Government had done quite sufficient to give it the confidence of the country by the three measures it had carried, the Clergy Reserves, the Seigniorial Tenure, and the Legislative Council Bills. These three Bills have been the whole trading capital of this coalition for the last two years. (Hear, hear.) Not a single important measure have they been able to originate; these three measures were left them as a legacy by their predecessors, and on these they have existed. And even in regard to these three measures, will any one say that their Bills were such as to give satisfaction to any party, whether Reform or Conservative? Will any member of the Government say that any one of these three measures was such as he personally would have framed it? Could the Clergy Reserves Bill have been grateful to either section of the Ministry? Was it not forced upon one section, and in direct opposition to the principles of the other? We all know, sir, that no party was satisfied with the measure as it passed. And just so was it with regard to the Seigniorial Bill. That measure passed this house in one shape, and was sent to the Legislative Council — but it was followed up there by the very men who voted for it below, and it was sent back and accepted here in an entirely different shape — improved certainly, but acceptable to nobody. Then, sir, with regard to the Legislative Council Bill, who is satisfied with that measure? Is there a single member of this house who will say he is satisfied with it?¹⁸⁶ Its own supporters had lobbied against it in the Upper House.¹⁸⁷ The very gentleman (Mr. Cauchon) who had charge of the Bill, and who had always voted against the principle of a double elective chamber until the moment he got office, was forced to admit the other night that he could not say it was such a Bill as he wanted, but the Legislative Council had sent it so down, and so he would accept it. Will any reform member say that that Bill is to his mind? — that an eight years' chamber is what he would have desired? — that having part of the chamber elected and part appointed — that a £2,000 qualification, that half a dozen prominent features of that Bill are not most ungrateful to them? Will any Conservative member of the Government, — will the Inspector General or the Attorney General West, dare to say that they desired this double elective chamber, that it was not forced upon them by their colleagues and by the necessities of the coalition? Yet these are the measures for which they take so much credit, and ask us to laud them for. But if the hon. gentlemen have no great Bills there are some schemes which they may fairly claim as their own. They have a scheme for the establishment of a Government Police Force all over the country. They put their scheme before the house, — they pledged themselves to stand by it — but to this moment they have not dared to submit it to a vote of this house. Is it in consistency with the feelings of the people of Canada? Has not every municipal corporation to be affected by it, declared utterly against it? And what is to be the cost of this precious scheme? — Why, £44,000 a-year, according to the estimate of the government, but, probably in fact, a much larger figure. We are to be saddled with this heavy burden to carry out a measure for which not one petition is before us, of which we hear nothing but opposition. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have their schemes with regard to education. Their scheme for Lower Canada was long and loudly spoken of — but what was it when it came? Instead of a broad comprehensive measure, framed with a view to the whole interests of Lower Canada, framed to furnish education for the whole population — we had a scheme to educate 15,000 children of the rich portion of the community, at an expense of £22,000 per annum from the public chest — and that secured by statute — while all the rest of the children of the Province, 300,000 in number, are to have for their education some £16,000 or £18,000 doled out by an annual vote of the Legislature! We had, too, sir, the Law Bill of the Attorney General West, which was described by one of the leading lawyers in the house as a very “harmless” measure. And we have another measure — the Ecclesiastical Corporations' Bill —¹⁸⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The “abominable” Bill.¹⁸⁹

MR. BROWN. — Yes, “the abominable Bill;” into which the hon. gentlemen were driven by public opinion outside, and by the pressure within this House, to introduce two most important amendments which have probably made it acceptable to the House¹⁹⁰, and in direct antagonism to the known and expressed views of the Government and their supporters. (Hear, hear.)¹⁹¹ We have also heard of other

measures, but as yet we have not seen them. The Commissioner of Crown Lands was to have given us a measure for the improvement of the Land system — no appearance of that. He was also to have given us a Survey Bill; — no appearance of that. We were to have had a Bill connected with the Post Office; — no appearance of that. We were to have had a Juvenile Offenders Bill; — no appearance of that. The Speech from the Throne promised us a Prison Bill; — no appearance of that. How many weeks of the session were we not left without a single Government measure in our hands! But the truth of the matter is, that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches have not had time either to prepare or to pass Bills. They have been engaged from morning to night in keeping up the Coalition, in soothing their supporters. (Hear, hear.) That constant labour of patching up their divisions has been the great difficulty of the Cabinet, a difficulty inseparable from a Coalition. I have no doubt there are gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, who could individually avow a policy. I have no doubt the Attorney General West, who while in opposition did avow more liberal sentiments than in the days when he was a high Tory, could indicate a bold policy. He has convictions, if he has not principles. But would his colleagues agree with him? Would the member for Montmorenci or the Receiver General agree with him? Could the Postmaster General attempt to carry out his own views? Look, sir, at the platform we assented to in 1851, and which it has been proved that he assented to, by letters from the most respectable electors of his own country [sic]. That platform, sir, contained the most radical, the most “levelling” principles, perhaps ever avowed by any public man in this country. Yet there he sits, alongside of the Inspector General, the very embodiment of Toryism in Upper Canada, and the Commissioner of Crown Lands, the embodiment of Papal Toryism in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) Is there a measure that can be brought forward, on which, if they all spoke their honest sentiments, they would not be wide as the poles asunder? When they do unite, it is by trampling on their principles, by doing not what they consider right, but what is necessary to keep themselves in office. (Hear, hear.) And the discord among their followers is still more marked. They have to please men of all views. How can they satisfy by one measure the member for Kamouraska and the member for Rimouski, on the one hand, holding as they do, the strongest ultra montane views to be found in Papal Lower Canada — the members for Brockville, Prince Edward, and Simcoe, extreme Upper Canada Protestant Tories — and gentlemen who have come in here, by professing the principles of the Postmaster General’s platform? How could it be possible that such a Coalition could lay down a policy for the guidance of the affairs of this country, which would be at all of a consistent or straightforward character.¹⁹² This inconsistency, this vacillation and ineffectiveness arise inevitably from the discordant elements of a coalition ministry. It is only by wholesale purchasing of support, and unprincipled concessions, that the members of such an administration can hold their offices, and get on with the conduct of public affairs of the country. (Laughter.) Hon. gentlemen may affect to treat these statements with laughter; but is it not true in every particular?¹⁹³ Their whole energies have been expended on keeping their strange gathering of supporters together, by plans and schemes which waste the public money and demoralize the public mind. (Hear, hear.)¹⁹⁴

MR. THIBAudeau. — Why don’t you talk of the North Shore Road!¹⁹⁵

MR. BROWN. — Sir, I think the hon. gentleman should keep quiet about the North Shore Road. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman only a few days [ago] was denouncing this Coalition Government just as strongly as I am doing now. Ten days ... are not gone, since that hon. gentleman, and a large section with him, were prepared to vote want of confidence in the Administration. — How is it that they are all so quiet to-night? (Hear, hear.) How is it that we hear nothing from Mr. O’Farrell, from Mr. Thibaudeau, from Mr. Desaulniers, from Mr. Turcotte — that they are *all* suddenly so quiet? What has produced the wondrous change? And the member for Quebec (Mr. Evanturel,) who told us he came to this house for the purpose of getting the North Shore Railroad, and that he would support any Administration which would give him that; ten days ago, that hon. gentleman was ready to turn out the Administration — how then does it come that he is found with the ministry to-night? Sir, it is because the public

chest has been placed at the disposal of these members banded together — the public domain is used to satisfy their demands! (Loud cries of hear, hear.) How is it that the Commissioner of Crown Lands is now sitting so quietly in his seat? Did we not see the ferment he was in a few nights ago, flying about among his supporters, who had told him — “If you do not leave the Government, we will go into opposition without you.” What was the result? The hon. gentleman went to his colleagues and forced them to grant the North Shore Railroad, under the penalty of being turned out of office. Do we not know that they are sitting there, on the Treasury Benches, at the price of four millions of acres taken from the public domain, and handed over to Mr. Baby and his friends.¹⁹⁶

Hear, hear, and laughter from the ministerial side.¹⁹⁷

[MR. BROWN continued:] Can anything more clearly show the state of demoralization to which the coalition has brought the house and the country, than that such a transaction dare be perpetrated in open day, and made a subject of laughter in this house? (Hear, hear.) Is the fact that four millions of public land have been extracted from the Government by a small section of their followers, by deliberate bargain and sale, as the price and the penalty of office, a fitting subject of merriment? (Hear, hear.) Discreditable as it may be to the Government, it is yet to be hoped for the sake of the country, that this act of robbery is only an arrangement made for present convenience, which there is no serious intention of carrying out. It may be that their aim has been to buy the support of those gentlemen for the moment, till they have got through the difficulties which now beset them, and that then the North Shore members may go whistle for their railroad. (Hear, hear.) It is exceedingly likely that this may be the end of it, and then we shall see those hon. gentlemen just as strongly in opposition as they were a few nights ago. Such a state of things never could exist except under a coalition Government.¹⁹⁸ The hon. Attorney General West is known by every one to be opposed to this North Shore Railway job, and many of his own colleagues¹⁹⁹ from Upper Canada long resisted this job. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Montmorenci affected to be coming out of the cabinet upon it — and then his colleagues yielded. I say that if the Attorney General West had not been a member of a coalition Government he would never have become a party to so scandalous a transaction²⁰⁰. (Hear, hear.)²⁰¹ Even there, if he had not felt that his whole course had been such as to forfeit entirely the confidence of the people of Upper Canada, he would have stood out firmly, he would have set his supporters at defiance, and have told them, “You may support the administration or not, you shall not have the public lands.” But no; the coalition was organized, not for the interests of the country, but for the interests of the ten gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, and the four millions of acres are to be torn from the public domain. And we had another scene of pretty much the same kind. The North Shore Railroad had been subsidized and the Grand Trunk must also get its appropriation. And what was the course of proceeding? These Grand Trunk stockholders came coolly to the house, saying, “Now you have brought us into such a position that we cannot go on further without your assistance: it is necessary for the credit of the country and the interest of the stockholders; and therefore we pray you to give us either a large sum of money, or guarantee us five per cent. upon our debt.” The Inspector General deemed it desirable to give some assistance to the Grand Trunk; he went to his supporters and told them so; but what did he say to them? “It is right that this should be done for the benefit of the country?” No; he got up a crafty scheme framed for the express purpose of bribing the whole house. (Hear, hear.) Will he deny that the letter published in the newspapers bearing his signature is a genuine letter; that it fully detailed a scheme got up by him and sent to Mr. Napier for his assistance? (Hear, hear.) And what was the character of that scheme? Why it agreed to give assistance to the Grand Trunk — but only on the condition that the Grand Trunk should give a share of its plunder to other favoured schemes. If ever there was a scheme ruinous to the credit of the country, it was that proposition of the Inspector General. (Hear, hear.) And what was the result of it? He sent it to the agent of the Grand Trunk stockholders, and he rejected it at once! And no wonder he did so. The idea of a Government making a bargain with a railway corporation to borrow money for them and distribute

it as bribes! A more improper suggestion it would be difficult to fancy. But did the matter end there? Oh, no. The hon. gentleman brought forward another scheme — it is now either wholly or nearly matured — and yet we are within a few days of the end of the session, and not a word of its conditions has been told to this house. This much I believe, however, has transpired, that additional aid will be given to the road to the extent of £2,000,000 in the shape of preferential stock. The Province is to be saddled with ten millions of dollars at the demand of the Grand Trunk!²⁰² Why is it that these offers become known only through the public press, and are not communicated to the House. (Hear, hear.) This treatment, however, would be of a piece with the style of communication observed towards the legislature on other important occasions.²⁰³ Mark the conduct of the hon. gentleman on this matter. The Inspector General came down upon us one afternoon with the startling intelligence that the Grand Trunk Railway could no longer pay the interest on its debt to the Province of \$16,000,000 — he read a letter from the Vice President formally signifying the bankruptcy of the country — and he left us to believe that the half year's dividend due in January last, had not been paid and our bonds were under protest. (Hear, hear.) The interest had been due over three months and yet he professed to know nothing about the matter! All he knew was that there was Mr. Holmes's letter — and it came on him like a thunderbolt! (Hear, hear.) And how did the case afterwards turn out to be? Why that the interest had been regularly paid in January — paid by the agents of the company or the contractors — and that the Inspector General weeks before had full information of the fact —²⁰⁴

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY (hastily). — What fact?²⁰⁵

MR. BROWN. — The fact that the Inspector General had received a memorial informing him that the company could not pay the interest on the Provincial bonds — weeks before he told the house that Mr. Holmes's letter was the first intimation he had of it and came upon him “like a thunde[r]bolt.”²⁰⁶

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY (indignantly). — When the hon. gentleman says “weeks before” that, will he be so good as to say what he means?²⁰⁷

MR. BROWN meant this: that a memorial had been sent in by the company to the government some weeks — he could not say how many²⁰⁸ — before the Inspector General told us that he had never heard until the day previous that the debentures had to be met.²⁰⁹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY contradicted this.²¹⁰

MR. BROWN reiterated the statement. The facts were these. The hon. gentleman told us that he did not know anything about the matter — that the first intelligence he ever had about it was from Mr. Holmes's letter, and it was proved afterwards that the memorial had been handed to him²¹¹ some weeks before, and moreover as an executive director of the corporation he ought to have known the defalcation in payment of interest —²¹²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY would correct the erroneous impression which seemed to exist in the mind of the member for Lambton, by asking if it was stated in the said petition that the January interest had not been paid?²¹³

MR. BROWN. — True, but the demand for assistance was then known to the Government. (Hear, hear.)²¹⁴ The hon. gentleman had the statement in that memorials [sic] that the company could not pay the interest, and yet he told us that Mr. Holmes's letter gave him the first intimation of the fact. For weeks he was aware of it, but we were left in entire ignorance of the matter²¹⁵, although the finances of the country may become involved to the extent of £4,000,000²¹⁶! Not a word could we get out of the Administration but what was dragged from them in the course of debate! But the whole thing had an

object. The hon. gentleman led us to believe that a whole year's interest must be sent at once — he proposed an increase of the tariff to provide the means — he got it — and after all it turned out that the past due interest had been paid by the bankers of the company, and that possibly we might not be called upon to pay that due in July —²¹⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — There was no statement ever made that the January interest had not been paid.²¹⁸ The suggestion made in the House was that the Government should provide for the July dividend, but nothing was said of meeting the January default.²¹⁹

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman may not have stated in so many words that the January interest had not been paid, but that was the deduction of every hon. gentleman in this house. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) I asked him at the time if he meant to say that that interest had not been paid, — whether the bonds were lying under protest; and his reply was, "I know nothing more about it than is gathered from Mr. Holmes's letter!" (Hear, hear.) What other conclusion, then, could hon. members draw, than that it had not been paid?²²⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — From the letter of Mr. Holmes?²²¹

MR. BROWN. — Certainly.²²² The proposition put before the house was, to pay the January and July interest. And how could we be asked to pay that interest if it had been already paid by the company? The Inspector General may try to get out of the position in which he has placed himself, but it is clear that he was either in a position of scandalous ignorance upon the subject,²²³ as a Government director²²⁴ [and] Finance Minister of the Crown, or else that he did not state the facts of the case candidly to the house.²²⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — The document was open to all, whatever construction was to be placed upon it, was in the power of any hon. gentleman in the house to avail himself of. The hon. gentleman has endeavoured to draw a false conclusion. He has thrown upon me the imputation that I was the concoctor of some shuffling trick, and has cast upon me what his inferences and suspicions were as to the document itself. If the letter throws a doubt upon the fact, it was not my act.²²⁶

MR. BROWN continued: the hon. Inspector General has himself applied the term "shuffling trick" to his own conduct upon that occasion. — (Great sensation.)²²⁷ I did not do so — but if he chooses to apply that term to it, I shall certainly not contradict him. (Hear, hear.)²²⁸

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY repudiated such an application of the term he had employed.²²⁹

MR. BROWN would not be particular to insist upon the precise term of describing the culpability of the Finance Minister, as in any case his position was bad enough. If he did not know of the embarrassments his ignorance was most deplorable, and if he had before seen the letter of Mr. Holmes, then had he himself aptly described his own conduct as a "shuffling trick." (Sensation.)²³⁰ I ask this house to decide upon the conduct of this Government in this matter, and to say whether men who so act are entitled to receive the confidence of the country. Put it in the best light. Just fancy a Finance minister coming down to Parliament, and reading a letter which he himself could not explain, and left us to guess at the conclusion that £4,000,000 of Provincial Bonds were lying under protest for non-payment of interest. Could there possibly be a more complete condemnation of the hon. gentleman's conduct than the bare fact that he got up in this house to make a grave financial statement on a subject of such moment without being able to say whether the past-due interest upon our debentures was paid or not? Could anything be more calculated than this to damage the credit of the country among capitalists abroad? (Hear, hear.) Why did he speak so recklessly? — why did he not go to Mr. Holmes, and learn the whole facts, before he opened his mouth upon it? (Hear, hear.) He was a member of the Board of Direction at that

very moment — he was the paid officer of the contractors, by virtue of his position [as] a minister of the crown — and how could he dare to come down here and make the statement of ignorance which he did, when all the documents were as open to him as to Mr. Holmes — when he ought to have been equally well-informed of the facts as the Vice-President of the Company!²³¹ Besides showing how vicious is the system of having the Financial officer of the Province a paid member of the Grand Trunk Direction, and at the same time also a salaried officer of the Executive, this exposure proves the utter incapacity of the hon. Inspector General for the responsible place he now occupies. (Loud cries of hear, hear.)²³² And has not his incapacity been evident to us the whole session? Look at the report made by the Committee of Public Accounts.²³³ What will be there found? Why, abundant evidence of the incompetence of that hon. gentleman.²³⁴ Has he attempted to deny the crushing allegations of the report? No; and nothing could be more humiliating to a Finance Minister than the palliations of the hon. gentleman.²³⁵ [OR] What can be more humiliating to the Government, and more hazardous to public credit? (Hear, hear.)²³⁶ He grasps at the compliments paid to Mr. Langton; he appropriates them to himself, with the cool reflection — “Did we not put the right man in the right place? We put him there to show us the difficulties we laboured under!”²³⁷ (Much laughter.)²³⁸ After being two years in office, the hon. gentleman takes credit to himself for having employed Mr. Langton to do the work for which he himself was appointed! What must people think of the hon. gentleman’s capacity, when he takes credit to himself that he has found a nurse — a wet nurse — for himself?²³⁹ (Great laughter.)²⁴⁰ The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton) stated that the head of our Executive Department had drawn £33,000 from the public chest — that others had drawn large amounts — and that, altogether, the hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches at the heads of departments, had drawn out of the public chest no less a sum than £100,000, which the responsible officer, the Receiver General, did not know anything about! (Hear, hear.) And what reply did the Inspector General make to all this? His answer is — “Suppose it is so, others did it; it was an old abuse, existing under my predecessor.” Is that an excuse to be made to this house? Here is a statement that the official returns of the amount of money in the public chest, at any one moment, are not to be relied upon — and the Inspector General says, “*It is all right enough — Mr. Hincks did it.*” (Hear, hear.)²⁴¹ There are likewise other statements equally damnatory, of which the country will, no doubt, take due notice, and anxiously reflect upon.²⁴² The hon. member for Montreal also alleged that contracts to a large amount had been given out to parties, without any tender being sent in; and this went entirely without contradiction. It is thus that these public accounts are swelling up every year. And the whole of the public departments seem to be in the same condition.²⁴³ Then the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches seemed to have as little confidence in each other as the people had in the whole Ministry.²⁴⁴ Could any hon. member have failed to notice the scene which took place between the Attorney General East, and the Commissioner for Public Works a few weeks ago. We had the great question of the Seat of Government coming up here for discussion, and we passed an address to the Government to send us down estimates of the cost of erecting public buildings at various places. It was transmitted to the Commissioner of Public Works by the Executive Council, to prepare the returns with all haste, but the Attorney General for Lower Canada had so little confidence in his colleagues, so little faith in the Department of Public Works, that he actually employed a private architect to make those very estimates which had been asked for by Parliament! (Hear, hear.) And he rated his colleague (Mr. Lemieux) for the slow manner in which he had proceeded, admitting that he had little confidence in the Department of Public Works, and admitting that he [Mr. Lemieux] had selected a gentleman in whom full confidence could not be placed. (Hear, hear.) And we had a few nights later, another peep into the ministerial way of doing things. The Inspector General came down here without exposing to us the condition of the public chest, or giving us an estimate of his expenditures or receipts, and asked the house to increase the whole Customs duties of the country 25 per cent., in order to enable him to meet the interest upon the Grand Trunk debt. We tried to induce him to put off his proposition for the moment, but he would not; and he got the taxation increased at his demand! Now Sir, if I understand the scheme which is now proposed by that hon. gentleman in aid of the Grand Trunk, he will not require this money. (Hear,

hear.) He proposes to enable the Grand Trunk to pay off their interest and complete their works by the sale of preferential stock. (Hear, hear.) And there is another incident connected with the Tariff Bill²⁴⁵ [which shows that] even in the case of augmenting the tariff, the honorable gentlemen could not act upright and fairly.²⁴⁶ Has it ever been denied by the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cartier) that when that tariff was passing through this house, and when the Government had determined the day when they intended to put it into operation, that he, a member of the Ministry, telegraphed down to Montreal to some of his friends the time when the Government meant to bring it into operation²⁴⁷, while in the same breath that information was denied to the House.²⁴⁸ Then again, sir, recall the Duval case. A proposition was made in this house by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron) to address his Excellency for a return of the Judge's charge in the Corrigan case, and he carried his motion in spite of the Administration. The Administration upon that, came down to this house and declared that they would resign unless that vote was rescinded; but when brought up to [sic] the point how did they act? They voted nay, on the previous question, and thereby choked off the subject altogether, and the vote now stands recorded upon our Journal contrary to their views, and they dare not attempt to remove them. I shall not allude to the conduct of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the Premier, Sir Allan MacNab; but yet we all know that caucuses were held, and everything was arranged to eject that hon. gentleman from the Government. From the beginning to the end of the session we have had nothing but never ending scenes of caballing and threatened resignation.²⁴⁹ (Hear, hear.) They had evaded every question of importance to the country, and dodged the responsibility belonging to them as Ministers of the Crown.²⁵⁰ What did we witness the other night on the question of Sectarian Schools, which has so much agitated the country? The ministry dared not face the question — they dared not vote yea or nay, and so they threw it over by a side-wind for the rest of the session. (Hear, hear.) And so it was with the question of Representation by Population, another question of the very greatest moment. They raised technical objections, and prevented its being debated! So also was it with the motion for a Repeal of the Union; that was thrown over also. And this has been the style of evasion adopted throughout, because the hon. gentlemen could not agree among themselves, or get their supporters to do so. As regards the Seat of Government, their conduct has been still more blameable.²⁵¹ They have repeatedly expressed themselves in favour of the selection of a central site; and now²⁵² they have chosen as a permanent Seat the extreme east end of the Province, a city several hundred miles from the centre of civilization, most difficult of access, and with a climate unfit for the assembling of the Legislature. And yet the government come down and ask the house to vote £50,000 to commence the erection of permanent buildings there. The Inspector General estimates the works at £275,000, and £225,000 will be drawn from the pockets of the people of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.)²⁵³ Do they imagine that Upper Canada will put up with the expenditure of £225,000 for a permanent seat of government, so far removed from the centres of population, intelligence, wealth and business?²⁵⁴ They greatly mistake if they suppose so. Upper Canada will never submit to be carried permanently down to Quebec, any more than the people of Lower Canada would submit to be carried to London, the most westerly city of Upper Canada. If this Union is to be maintained, the wishes of the people of Upper Canada cannot be always set utterly at defiance. I see the hon. member (Mr. Chabot) is quite astonished, and quite indignant. But the hon. gentleman lives at Quebec. He was the author of all the Baby contracts. He has not forgotten the Durham Terrace. He has not forgotten the Nautical School, and a vast number of other nice jobs all perpetrated in Quebec, when he was Chief Commissioner of Public Works. (Hear, hear.) The people of Upper Canada think it most unjust that the Government departments should be sent down to the eastern extremity of Lower Canada —²⁵⁵

MR. LARWILL. — It is not so.²⁵⁶

MR. BROWN. — When the hon. gentleman goes back to his constituents he will find that it is so. I shall be astonished if he does not find that the vote he gave for Quebec is one which has raised against him more indignation than all the other bad votes he ever gave.²⁵⁷

MR. LARWILL. — I do not care!²⁵⁸

MR. BROWN. — I have no doubt he does not care, for he knows he cannot come here again. I can understand the argument for a permanent Seat of Government at some central point. But I cannot believe it possible to carry on this Union by selecting a place either entirely under the influences of Upper Canada, or entirely under the influences of Lower Canada; the alternate system was fallen upon as a way of meeting the difficulty. I do not myself think it was the *only* means. I believe a central locality could have been where a permanent Seat of Government could have been established. But to say that Quebec should be chosen, and that the Government should ask from us for public buildings there a vote of £300,000, of which £225,000 will be taken from the pockets of the people of Upper Canada — I am sure that is a proposition to which the people of Upper Canada never will submit, and that rather than submit to it, they will consent to change the relations now subsisting between the two sections of the Province. (Cries of oh! oh! and hear, hear.) I am sure, when I say this I speak the sentiment of the people of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) And I appeal to gentlemen from Lower Canada, what they would have said, if, instead of Quebec, London had been chosen; and observe that there is a much larger population west of London, than east of Quebec.²⁵⁹

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS. — London is not fit for the Seat of Government.²⁶⁰

MR. BROWN. — I can tell the hon. gentleman that London is a place fifty times more fit for the Seat of Government than Quebec. And let hon. gentlemen from Upper Canada bear in mind, that that is the simple question we have to decide to-night, whether or not we shall go down permanently to legislate in Quebec under all the influences there prevailing. While Parliament was in Quebec, how few people came down from Upper Canada to transact business with us, while this session, we cannot fail to have observed how our lobbies and committee rooms have been crowded with people from Upper Canadian countries [sic], having Private Bills to get through. Does not this show, that with the Government in Quebec, the private business of Upper Canada of a legislative character, cannot be well attended to. Perhaps Toronto would not be a suitable place for the private business of Lower Canada, although I believe it will ere long be nearly the centre of population, and some place to the eastward of this might very properly be chosen — but to carry us away down to the very end of civilization, I had almost said, is perfectly preposterous. (Hear, hear.) I think there is more importance to be attached to this vote than some honourable gentlemen may be willing to admit. It is all very well for us, sitting here, and looking to keeping the administration in their seats, and to little measures of our own which we may wish to carry through, and the influence the Executive may exercise in putting them through for us, to treat the question lightly. But if we look beyond this house, to the great interests of the country, and the future destinies of the Province, we must feel that a deep responsibility is laid upon us to-night in regard to the decision we may give. We cannot shut our eyes to the difficulties that exist, in carrying on this Union. We are two peoples, two races, having two languages and two religions. And under our system of government, and on account of the differences that have existed among ourselves in Upper Canada, the result has been that one section has had the control of the Government, and of the public chest, and have ruled the united Province. (Hear, hear.) And if in addition to that, we are still to be denied Representation by Population, if we are to have only the same number of representatives as Lower Canada, while we have a population 300,000 greater — if we are to continue to pay £3 of taxation for every £1 of our neighbors, and are moreover to be dragged down to Quebec to legislate there, far removed from those influences which we would desire to see swaying the legislation of the country — then I say if we vote to-night and affirm that such in future shall be the degraded position of Upper Canada, we are taking upon ourselves a most solemn responsibility. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen should consider well, whether they are prepared to meet all the consequences, and all the difficulties, which such a vote as that will certainly entail. On such a question I think we are entitled to some declaration of their sentiments, at the hands of the Upper Canada members of the Administration.

They cannot shut their eyes to the fact that it is one of very great moment. Soon we will have the question of a Federal Union presented to us, and a Dissolution of the Union, and other cognate questions, and the decision the house will give to-night, will undoubtedly exert a powerful influence on the fate of all these important questions.²⁶¹ As to the letter containing certain propositions to the hon. Mr. Napier, the honorable Inspector General did not pretend to deny the document, but merely found fault with the mode of obtaining it for publication. That letter is dated at the Inspector General's office, and it is stated to be passed on the "anxious consideration" of the Government, how therefore could it require the minute explanations, without which the hon. Inspector General says it is incomplete? But is it not a fact that some of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, including the Premier (Sir Allan McNab) had never seen the communication until it was published in the *Globe*? (hear, hear); and did not the hon. Atty. General West (Mr. Macdonald) on that account threaten to resign? Could anything be more unbecoming in a Ministry, or more disastrous to the interests of the country? He hoped, for all these reasons, that the House would now purge itself of the reproach of having formerly sustained the administration, and by voting for this non confidence motion prove to their respective constituents that there is yet some hope of public safety.²⁶²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY rose to explain one or two points, which he said had not been correctly represented by the member for Lambton.²⁶³

MR. BROWN. — Then I will claim the privilege of replying — (No, no).²⁶⁴

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — The hon. gentleman will have to hear such explanations, as may be offered, before he knows whether a reply is required.²⁶⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY wished simply to correct a misstatement of a fact, because the hon. member has in his usual way, indulged in threatenings, as to the opinions and impressions made upon the country. It was most important to test the accuracy of his assertions by what had taken place to-night. That hon. gentleman has stated that he (Mr. Cayley) was in possession of this information in regard to the Grand Trunk defalcation ... in the month of February,²⁶⁶ and that he had concealed it from the House and his colleagues in the Government. He (Mr. Cayley) had already stated that the memorial from the Grand Trunk had not been in [the] possession of the Government for more than a week, before he made the announcement in the House. And the letter from Mr. Holmes, which he read on the 11th April, stated that the resolution of the Grand Trunk, asking aid from the Government, was dated on the previous day, the 10th.²⁶⁷

MR. BROWN. — It was the memorial of the 13th March I spoke of.²⁶⁸

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said that the letter from Mr. Holmes further asked him to submit the communication at the earliest practicable moment to the Executive Council. Was not this a clear admission that the communication Mr. Holmes was making, was not then known to the Executive?²⁶⁹

MR. BROWN. — The statement I made was in reference to the previous memorial, dated the 13th March, which the hon. gentleman stated even to-night was in his hands a week beforehand.²⁷⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Does that memorial speak of the January dividend?²⁷¹

MR. GALT. — My impression is that it spoke of the July dividend.²⁷²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Very good! That was quite sufficient. In the memorial, on which the hon. member depended, as the ground for charging him [Mr. Cayley] that he had withheld information from the House, there was no statement about the January dividend, or about the 4 millions of debentures under protest.²⁷³ And yet it is stated throughout the length of Canada that the Inspector

General was previously in possession of that information.²⁷⁴ He believed, however, that allusion was made to the July dividend, and it was in consequence of the urgent demand made that he would at once bring the matter under the notice of the Executive, that they might make provision for the default — it was in consequence of this, that on the following day he read the letter to the House, and intimated his intention to bring in a Bill for raising the Customs duties. Passing from that point, he would allude for a moment to another charge, — that he had taken no notice of the apparent inaccuracy or incorrect statement of the balances in the Provincial Chest. This was a point that required some little explanation. The Fiscal Agent of the Province, through a practice introduced by the Hon. Mr. Young, now the Chairman of Public Accounts, had been accustomed to take up the certificates issued by the Board of Works after they were cashed by the banks. The practice of putting forward those certificates, was first introduced, as he understood from Mr. Begl[e]y, by Mr. Young. The Board of Works at the commencement of the year was put in possession of the appropriation book, in which were entered the votes of the House for the various works, which authorized the Board to enter into contracts, and spend money on those improvements. The Board issued certificates on the works performed. The banks cashed those certificates, and they were sent in at the close of the month to be cashed by the Government. And this was a practice introduced by the Hon. Mr. Young, who now found fault with the Government, and whose fault finding was re-echoed by the member for Lambton, as if some gross mismanagement on the part of the present Government had been discovered.²⁷⁵ So much for the candid, generous conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite.²⁷⁶ The hon. member said that at the end of two years he (Mr. Cayley) had got a dry-nurse to keep him in order.²⁷⁷

A Member. — A wet-nurse. (Laughter.)²⁷⁸

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said the fact was that the Government had not been in existence for above six months, before they brought in their Audit Bill, and the Auditor was appointed as soon afterwards as possible. This was another misrepresentation of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member had also made some remarks with reference to a letter which appeared a short time ago in the columns of the *Globe* newspaper. He saw that letter in the columns of the *Globe* with some surprise. Of course any correspondence which might take place between a member of the Government and the agent of the Grand Trunk shareholders, would ultimately appear before the public. But it was very unusual, while negotiations were going on, before the basis of arrangement was determined on, and before parties had declared their distinct views — it was very unusual that those imperfect negotiations and details should be laid before the public, before the whole was brought to a close. He was therefore, somewhat surprised to see that paper in the columns of the *Globe* newspaper. But shortly afterwards he had a letter from Mr. Napier, assuring him that he had been no party to the publication of an imperfect and incomplete correspondence.²⁷⁹ The hon. gentleman here read Mr. Napier's letter, as follows:

To the Hon. William Cagley [sic], Inspector General, &c. &c.

TORONTO, May 12, 1856.

SIR; — Having observed the publication in the *Daily Globe* of your letter and memorandum of the 6th instant, to myself, and having heard that an unauthorized and incorrect copy of my reply thereto, is being circulated in some of the Provincial journals — it is due to myself as to you, Sir, to inform you, that I have in no way been a party directly or indirectly, to the publication of a confidential and incomplete correspondence on such a grave subject, as the affairs of the Grand Trunk Company.

It was my duty, Sir, pursuant to my instructions, to advise confidentially with certain gentlemen, the authorities of the Grand Trunk Company, upon any correspondence with the Government on the subject, and it was my desire to place each member of the Executive Government in possession of such correspondence in such a shape as to enable the better comprehension of the difficulties under consideration.

I consulted my advisers and made such arrangements, under distinct assurances of that secrecy which is imperative in such matters, and it has given me the deepest pain to witness the result, which by an

attempt to prejudge the intentions of the Government, outlived by at [sic] sketch, inviting my remarks and counter-suggestions, must necessarily be damaging to the interests of the Railway and of the country which are inseparably connected.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Yours obediently,

WILLIAM NAPIER,

On behalf of the Committee of Shareholders
of the Grand Trunk Railroad Company of
Canada.

Mr. Cayley said he did not however need that explanation to convince him that Mr. Napier had not been instrumental in giving that letter clandestinely for publication.²⁸⁰ The correspondence was incomplete, and much that passed in conversation was necessary to be known, to explain that, which unexplained could not be understood. The letter was merely sent as a basis on which they might consult, and he had no knowledge by means of what breach of confidence, it had reached the columns of the *Globe*.²⁸¹ He did not wish to occupy much of the time of the House. He had merely risen to correct a misapprehension as to the liability of the Province for the Grand Trunk bonds. The memorial that was sent to the Government was withdrawn almost immediately, in consequence of some important papers not having been communicated at the same time. He had received [the] memorial only some ten days before he made his statement the day following that on which he received the letter from Mr. Holmes. — He had therefore no reason to accuse himself of having kept back information from the House, or from his colleagues.²⁸²

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman, by the explanations he has given, has placed himself in a worse position than he formerly occupied. I have now the memorial before me, to which the hon. gentleman referred. The statement of the Inspector General was this, that he had no means of information that the company were unable to meet the interest on their debentures, until the letter of Mr. Holmes was put into his hands.²⁸³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Not so. I spoke of the memorial being the first intimation of the inability of the company to meet the July dividends, and at the present moment, I cannot say whether it referred to the January dividends or not. But that memorial was withdrawn, almost immediately after it was put before us, and I could not carry all its details in my memory. My impression, however, is that it spoke of the inability of the company to meet the July dividends.²⁸⁴

MR. BROWN. — The memorial is lying before me, and does not speak of anything of the kind. This just shows how little confidence can be placed in the statements of the hon. gentleman. I do not say that he states anything that is incorrect, knowing it to be so, but it shows how little he knows about the affairs which are entrusted to his management. It brings out the whole case in stronger relief. The hon. gentleman got up and made a grave accusation against me, as if I had been trying to make it appear that he was in possession of the information for a longer period than he really was.²⁸⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — So you did.²⁸⁶

[MR. BROWN continued:] He asked me, “how many weeks did you say?” I stated that my impression was that the memorial was dated about the end of February or beginning of March. And what is the fact? The letter was published on the 11th April, and here is the memorial, dated the 13th March, four weeks before. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman tells us he only got it a week before. Perhaps his recollection is imperfect. But I say this, that, if he speaks truly, that he never heard of it till a week before, it is a greater condemnation to him than anything that has yet come out. For who are the parties from whom this memorial comes? It comes from the hon. gentleman himself, from the Board of Directors, of which he is a paid member, and at which he sits to represent the interests of the Province. (Cheers.)²⁸⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — If the hon. gentleman will read the memorial, he will see it was written by a committee of the Board. The Board never saw it.²⁸⁸ (Hear, hear.)²⁸⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER hoped the Inspector General and the House would allow the facts to be fairly elucidated. (Chair, chair.)²⁹⁰

MR. BROWN. — We shall see that presently. In the memorial, it is said — “Your memorialists are bound in all candor to state that they see no means whereby they can continue to sustain the credit of the company by the payment of the interest on their own and on the Province Bonds without assistance.” (Hear, hear.) And it is “Signed on behalf of the Company, By order of the Board, Benjamin Holmes, Vice President, Geo. Crawford, James Beaty, Committee of Directors.” And there is a resolution attached to it. “Extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company held in Toronto: Resolved, that the Vice President, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. James Beaty, be appointed a committee to draft and sign a memorial to his Excellency the Governor General, praying that additional aid may be given to the Company by the Province, to assist in completing the line from Stratford to Sarnia, with a branch to London, to secure the traffic through Canada over the Grand Trunk line, and also the Provincial aid, to proceed with, and complete the Victoria Bridge; containing also the further prayer that the Province do forego its prior claim upon the receipts of the Railway Fund with the shareholders.” Does not this show that the whole memorial was the work of the Board? Had the Board not the full information possessed by their sub-committee? In drawing up that report of 13th March, did not the sub-committee act on the express instructions of the Board?²⁹¹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Read it! He will not read it through! (Hear, hear, and confusion.)²⁹²

MR. BROWN. — Does he mean me to read the whole memorial?²⁹³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Yes!²⁹⁴

MR. BROWN. — There is a column and a half of it.²⁹⁵

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — If the hon. gentleman will give it to the Clerk, it will be read at length. (No, no, hear, hear.)²⁹⁶

MR. BROWN then handed the document to the Clerk.²⁹⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — I will show why it is important to read it. The directions of the Board were to draw up a memorial on certain points, which do not refer to the dividends. Instructions were simply to ask for further aid, and the Committee having been appointed, the Board adjourned.²⁹⁸ The committee went to work and prepared their memorial,²⁹⁹ and the first notification of the necessity to meet the dividend, was in the memorial, the Board knowing nothing about it.³⁰⁰

MR. BROWN. — What was the aid wanted for, but to pay those dividends? (Cheers.) And the Committee were instructed by the Board to draw up a memorial, applying for that aid. Observe the position in which the Inspector General places himself. He sits as a paid Director of the Company to protect the interests of the Province — this most important proceeding, this declaration of bankruptcy by the Company — was put on record by the Vice-President and two of the Directors on the 13th of March, and yet the Inspector General tells us he knew nothing at all about it, no, not for weeks after! (Cheers.) The House was at the time in session, the member for Brockville (Mr. Crawford) was daily in communication with the Inspector General; Mr. Holmes was here also; the Hon. John Ross his colleague in the Cabinet, was President of the road; and yet the hon gentleman was in helpless ignorance that his company was bankrupt! (Loud cheers.) If the honourable gentleman did not know of it, I venture to say there was

not another member of the Board who was in the same ignorance. A declaration of bankruptcy was made on the 13th of March, yet the Inspector General never knew anything about it, till the letter of Mr. Holmes came upon him like a thunderbolt on the 11th April!³⁰¹ Only fancy! What a very creditable statement for a Finance Minister! But who could believe it? What was it that so astounded the hon. gentleman if not the bankruptcy of the company?³⁰² I ask, Mr. Speaker, are the whole affairs of this country to be played battledore and shuttlecock with in that sort of way? Are transactions amounting to 16 millions of dollars to be dealt with in that style? Are resolutions to be sent out by a Committee of the Grand Trunk, announcing their bankruptcy, proposing to repudiate their whole debt, and throw it upon the Province, and yet the hon. gentleman know nothing about it?³⁰³ It was absurd to think of such a thing.³⁰⁴ What was the thunderbolt that fell upon the hon. gentleman? He says it was in regard to the payment of the January dividends. But that was not the point. Did he not know that before? He says himself that the memorial was for a week before in his hands, and by that memorial he had been put in possession of the whole state of affairs.³⁰⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — My remark applied to the Brassey correspondence, and not to Mr. Holmes' letter.³⁰⁶

MR. BROWN. — I speak from memory, but I am pretty confident that when the honourable gentleman spoke of a thunderbolt, it was in connexion not with the Brassey correspondence, but with Mr. Holmes's letter.³⁰⁷ (Hear, hear; no, no.) He [Mr. Brown] felt assured of that.³⁰⁸ And the inaccuracy of the Inspector General is equally manifest in all his other assertions. He [Mr. Cayley] has stated deliberately, and repeated the assertion, that the Hon. John Young originated the system of paying money from the public chest, upon certificates of engineers, without the knowledge or assent of the Receiver General.³⁰⁹ On that point the House had heard what had fallen from the hon. member for Sherbrooke, and they would agree with that hon. gentleman that from the well-known business habits of the hon. member for Montreal, and his high commercial standing that he would never have initiated such a system. And he [Mr. Brown] would further say that it was exceedingly improper and unfair to make such a statement in the absence of that hon. gentleman.³¹⁰ It carries on its face its own contradiction, and well assured am I that when the accusation reaches Mr. Young it will be instantly contradicted. (Hear, hear.) Why, Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Hon. Inspector General cannot be true. What office did Mr. Young hold in the Government?³¹¹ Was he Finance Minister?³¹² [He was] Commissioner of Public Works! How then, sir, could he in any shape interfere with the public chest? By what authority could he make bank arrangements?³¹³ Ought the bank to have listened to him for a moment?³¹⁴

Loud cheers from the Opposition.³¹⁵

[MR. BROWN continued:] The thing is palpably untrue — and what is worse — I fear the hon. gentleman must have known it. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the bad practice was in existence long before Mr. Young's time — aye, sir, when the hon. gentleman himself was formerly in office. I appeal for the truth of this to the hon. gentleman's own supporters — I appeal to the hon. member for Lennox and Addington³¹⁶. Did ... [he] never draw certificates upon the banks?³¹⁷

MR. ROBLIN. — We have done so ever since we have had the Board of Works.³¹⁸

Loud cheers from the Opposition.³¹⁹

MR. BROWN. — Now, sir, where is the hon. gentleman's statement that my hon. friend from Montreal originated the system? (Cheers.) I do think that anything more scandalous than this charge against an absent member of the house has never before been witnessed and I trust never will be again. (Cheers.) But the Inspector General attempted to make a third point. He is very indignant at the publication of his famous letter to the Hon. Mr. Napier. He is sure there was a breach of confidence somewhere,

but *where* he cannot tell — and he is utterly confounded how the *Globe* got hold of it. (Hear, hear.)³²⁰ No doubt it was picked up by some newspaper devil in the street, and carried off to some of those dreadful newspapers.³²¹ But, Mr. Speaker, there was one thing satisfactory in the hon. gentleman's statement, he did not attempt to deny that the letter as published was a genuine document. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I beg the attention of the house to what the hon. gentleman says in reference to this letter: he says it was in an incomplete state — it was sent out without due consideration — it was not intended to be perused by itself, but was a mere informal memorandum requiring verbal explanations and private interviews to render it comprehensible.³²²

Ironical hear, hears, from the Opposition.³²³

[MR. BROWN] supposed it wanted some little ends to be dove tailed into it.³²⁴ Now, sir, I hold the document in my hand, and its contents give a flat contradiction to these allegations of the Inspector General. The letter is formally dated from the "Inspector General's office," and the following is its very first paragraph: —

"SIR, — I have now the honour, in reply to your request, to furnish you with a memorandum of the terms on which, after much anxious consideration, the Government conceive they would be justified in recommending to Parliament the granting of aid to the Grand Trunk Railroad."³²⁵

Loud cheers from the Opposition.³²⁶

[MR. BROWN continued:] And so, sir, it appears that this informal memorandum of to-night, was the "*anxiously considered*" determination of the Government itself! (Cheers.) It contained the precise and minute stipulations on which the Executive were prepared to justify before Parliament the desired aid to the Grand Trunk!³²⁷ Yet, the Inspector General dared to come down to that House and in the face of such a declaration say, that the proposal was only thrown out in a loose way, when it turned out to be a grave official document.³²⁸ Sir, I am not astonished that the hon. gentleman should feel ashamed of his production — that he attempts to bury it under a mountain of flimsy explanations — but I am astonished that he should not try to make his explanations tally with his letter. (Hear, hear.) Is it possible, sir, that the rumors attached to that letter are correct?³²⁹ [Is] it actually true that the Inspector General had dared to write such a document as that giving £800,000 of the public money to his avaricious supporters?³³⁰ Is it the fact that there were a number of his colleagues (even the Premier himself) who never saw that document until it appeared in the *Globe*? Is it true that the Premier felt grossly insulted on finding that the Inspector General had given the consent of the Government without his knowledge to a measure for which he never had their consent? And is it true³³¹ that the publication of that letter had led to a collision between the Premier and the Attorney General West³³² [who] threatened to resign³³³, and nearly caused the withdrawal of the Inspector General from the Cabinet? Pity that it should have been so, for undoubtedly it would be better that the whole House should tumble to pieces rather than that the honorable gentleman should have been compelled to withdraw.³³⁴

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY read some remarks of his as reported in the *Colonist*, by which it would appear that on the occasion referred to³³⁵, what he spoke of as coming upon him like a thunderbolt was the Brassey correspondence. (Hear, hear.)³³⁶

MR. TURCOTTE said it was due to the Inspector General to state that as far as Three Rivers was concerned, he knew nothing of the proposal of the Inspector General. (Hear, hear.) (Cries of adjourn.)³³⁷

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE rose and said — the hon. member for Lambton had expressed great surprise that some members of the Administration had not dared to answer any of the charges in reference to the policy of the Government which had been preferred against them³³⁸; and he (Mr. Spence) purposed now, with the indulgence of the House, to comment upon those attacks, and to answer the hon. gentleman's challenge.³³⁹

Several voices. — No, no; adjourn³⁴⁰ — go on, go on, and much confusion.³⁴¹

MR. MACKENZIE hoped the hon. Inspector [sic] General was not going to make a harangue at this hour of the morning. (Cries of adjourn, adjourn.)³⁴²

MR. CAMERON saw no prospect of bringing the debate to an early conclusion, and would therefore prefer to adjourn at this stage.³⁴³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said. — It being the desire of the House not to continue the debate, he would move that the House do now adjourn.³⁴⁴

(522)

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. *Spence*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Cameron*, The House adjourned.³⁴⁵

Appendix

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SUPERIOR COURT OF LOWER CANADA.]

MR. A. DORION proposera qu'une humble adresse soit présentée à son excellence le gouverneur-général, exposant à son excellence que le retard à remplir la vacance causée par le décès, en février dernier, de l'hon. George Vanfelson, un des juges de la cour supérieure pour le Bas-Canada, a occasionné des inconvénients graves dans la transaction des affaires devant la dite cour, demandant à son excellence qu'il lui plaise [de] remédier à ce grief, en nommant un successeur au juge décédé.³⁴⁶

Footnotes

1. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
7. *Globe*, 16 May 1856. Both this newspaper and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856, report that the introduction of Mr. Bellingham to the House occurred during the following debate on the want of confidence in the Administration.
8. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
9. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
16. In a commentary, *Globe*, 16 May 1856, remarks that "the excitement on the subject was intense, and the House was crowded to excess."

17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
18. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
19. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
20. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
21. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
22. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
23. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
26. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
27. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
28. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
30. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
31. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
32. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
33. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
34. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
35. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
36. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
37. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
38. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
39. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
40. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
41. *Pilot*, 19 May 1856.
42. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
43. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
44. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
45. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
46. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
47. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
48. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
49. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
50. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
51. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
52. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
53. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
54. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
55. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
56. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
57. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
58. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
59. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
60. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
61. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
62. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
63. *Ibid.*
64. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
66. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
67. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
69. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
70. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856. *Globe*, 16 May 1856, specifies that the gentleman to whom Mr. Cayley was referring is Mr. Young.
71. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
72. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.

73. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
74. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
75. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
76. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
77. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
78. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
79. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Ibid.*
82. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
83. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
85. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
86. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
87. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
88. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856.
89. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
91. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
92. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
93. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
95. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
96. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
97. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
98. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
99. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
100. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
101. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
104. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
105. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856 (in Scrapbook Hansard).
106. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
107. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
108. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
109. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
110. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
111. *Ibid.*
112. *Ibid.*
113. *Ibid.*
114. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
115. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
116. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
117. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
118. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
119. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
120. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
121. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
122. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
123. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
124. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
125. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
126. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
127. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
128. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
129. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.

130. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
131. *Ibid.*
132. *Pilot*, 20 May 1856.
133. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
134. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
135. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
136. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
137. *Pilot*, 20 May 1856.
138. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
139. *Pilot*, 20 May 1856.
140. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
141. *Pilot*, 20 May 1856.
142. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
143. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
144. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
145. *Ibid.*
146. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
147. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
148. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
149. *Ibid.*
150. *Ibid.*
151. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
152. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
153. *Pilot*, 20 May 1856.
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
155. *Montreal Gazette*, 19 May 1856.
156. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
157. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856. *Le Pays*, 23 May 1856, reports the following summary: "M. Marchildon attaque le gouvernement sur sa politique, mais il est en faveur du vote des argens pour établir le siège du gouvernement à Québec."
158. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
159. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
160. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
161. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
162. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
163. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
164. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
165. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
166. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
167. *Globe*, 16 May 1856. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856, reports that Mr. Mackenzie "exhibited a map made by dropping black sealing wax on a slip of paper for the purpose of showing the relative distances of the cities between London and Quebec from each other, and then holding each drop of wax momentarily against his temples for the purpose of pointing out the cities of London, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, and Quebec, he requested gentlemen to observe that Quebec is at the extreme end of the Province, with a population below it of only 160,000 souls, and then to state whether they would vote for it as the seat of Government." *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 23 May 1856, reports similar information.
168. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
169. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
170. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
171. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
172. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
173. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
174. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
175. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
176. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
177. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
178. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
179. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
180. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.

181. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
182. *Globe*, 16 May 1856.
183. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
184. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
185. *Globe*, 16 May 1856. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856, specifies that Mr. Mackenzie "spoke at great length".
186. *Globe*, 17 May 1856. This newspaper also reports that Mr. Brown rose to address the House "at 20 minutes to twelve".
187. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
188. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
189. *Ibid.*
190. *Ibid.*
191. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
192. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
193. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
194. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
195. *Ibid.*
196. *Ibid.*
197. *Ibid.*
198. *Ibid.*
199. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
200. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
201. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
202. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
203. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
204. *Globe*, 17 May 1856. Mr. Holmes' letter to the Legislative Assembly is reported in full in *Montreal Gazette*, 29 April 1856.
205. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
206. *Ibid.*
207. *Ibid.*
208. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
209. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
210. *Ibid.*
211. *Ibid.*
212. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
213. *Ibid.*
214. *Ibid.*
215. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
216. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
217. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
218. *Ibid.*
219. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
220. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
221. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
222. *Ibid.*
223. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
224. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
225. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
226. *Ibid.*
227. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
228. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
229. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
230. *Ibid.*
231. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
232. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
233. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
234. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
235. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
236. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
237. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.

238. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
239. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
240. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
241. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
242. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
243. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
244. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
245. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
246. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
247. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
248. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
249. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
250. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
251. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
252. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
253. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
254. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
255. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
256. *Ibid.*
257. *Ibid.*
258. *Ibid.*
259. *Ibid.*
260. *Ibid.*
261. *Ibid.*
262. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856, reports that Mr. Brown "spoke upwards of an hour".
263. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
264. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
265. *Ibid.*
266. *Ibid.*
267. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
268. *Ibid.*
269. *Ibid.*
270. *Ibid.*
271. *Ibid.*
272. *Ibid.*
273. *Ibid.*
274. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
275. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
276. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
277. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
278. *Ibid.*
279. *Ibid.*
280. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
281. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
282. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
283. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
284. *Ibid.*
285. *Ibid.*
286. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
287. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
288. *Ibid.*
289. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
290. *Ibid.*
291. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
292. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
293. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
294. *Ibid.*

295. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
296. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
297. *Ibid.*
298. *Globe*, 19 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856, reports that Mr. Cayley "rose and interrupted the reading".
299. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
300. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
301. *Ibid.*
302. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
303. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
304. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
305. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
306. *Ibid.*
307. *Ibid.*
308. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
309. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
310. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
311. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
312. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
313. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
314. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
315. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
316. *Ibid.*
317. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
318. *Globe*, 19 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856, mistakenly attributes this reply to Mr. Robinson.
319. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
320. *Ibid.*
321. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
322. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
323. *Ibid.*
324. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
325. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
326. *Ibid.*
327. *Ibid.*
328. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
329. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
330. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
331. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
332. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
333. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
334. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
335. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
336. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
337. *Ibid.*
338. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
339. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
340. *Ibid.*
341. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
342. *Ibid.*
343. *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856.
344. *Globe*, 19 May 1856. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856, reports that "a general cry was raised for an adjournment, to which the Ministry consented." Commentaries on the debate of this day are reported in *Globe*, 16 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 16 May 1856, and *Montreal Transcript*, 20 May 1856.
345. According to *Globe*, 19 May 1856, and *Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856, the House adjourned at "twenty minutes to two o'clock".
346. *Le Pays*, 15 May 1856. This report does not specify the date when the notice was given.

FRIDAY, 16 MAY 1856

(522)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *DeWitt*, — The Petition of *Andrew McGregor* and others, of *St. Andrews*.

By Mr. *Dionne*, — The Petition of the Reverend *N. Beaulieu* and others, of the Village of *Fraserville* and other places; the Petition of *Abraham Pelletier* and others, of the Parish of *St. George de Kakouna*; the Petition of *Antoine Fortin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Arsène*, County of *Temiscouata*; the Petition of *T. Michaud* and others, of the Parish of *St. André*, County of *Kamouraska*; the Petition of *P. Fournier* and others, of the Parish of *Trois Pistoles*; and the Petition of *Pierre Couturier*, senior, and others, of the Townships of *Whitworth* and *Viger*, County of *Temiscouata*.

(523)

By Mr. *Wilson*, — The Petition of *A. Grant* and others, of the Township of *London*; and the Petition of *Robert Burns* and others, of the County of *Middlesex*.

By Mr. *Bellingham*, — The Petition of *William Frazer* and others, of the Townships of *Kilkenny* and *Beauport*, County of *Montcalm*; and the Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of *Argenteuil*.

By Mr. *Taché*, — The Petition of *John R. Dickson*, and others.

By the Honorable Mr. *Rolph*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Townsend*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *L'Isle Verte*; praying aid for a Road.

Of *Ruben Côté* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jean Baptiste de L'Isle Verte*; praying that *Rivière du Loup* may be made the chief place of the *Kamouraska* District for Judicial purposes.

Of the Town Council of the Town of *Woodstock*; praying that the Town of *Woodstock* may be incorporated.

Of *Louis Fournier* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jean Port-Joli*; praying aid for Roads.

Of the Reverend *Louis A. Martel* and others, of the Township of *Settrington*; and of the Municipality of the Township of *Settrington*; praying that *Les Eboulemens* may remain as the chief place of the *Saguenay* District for Judicial purposes.

Of *Peter B. Nelles* and others, Members of the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*, of the Parish of *Grimsby*; praying that no Act may be passed to authorize the sale of a certain parcel of land in the Township of *Uxbridge*, conveyed by deed of gift for the endowment of the Rectory of *Grimsby*.

Of the Municipality of the Township of *Brock*; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.

Of *J. Bissonnette* and others, of *St. Valentin*; praying that no further guarantee may be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Of *Benonie Clouatre* and others, of *St. Valentin*; praying for an Elective Legislative Council, an Elective Governor, and the recall of Sir *Edmund Head*.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Eloi*; praying that the Petition from the inhabitants of *St. Eloi* relative to the removal of the chief place of the Judicial District of *Kamouraska* may not receive the consideration of the House, inasmuch as the said Petition was not signed for such purpose.

Mr. *James Smith*, from the Standing Committee on Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines, presented to the House the Eleventh Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have received a communication from Mr. *Thomas Keefer* offering to dispose of his Map of the Province, prepared for the *Paris* Exhibition, for the sum of Two hundred and

fifty pounds, and upon examination of the work, they find it to be most important and valuable. They therefore recommend the purchase of the Map for the said sum of Two hundred and fifty pounds, and that that amount be paid from the Contingencies of this House.

Mr. *Taché*, from the Joint Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly for the direction of the Library of Parliament, presented to the House the Third Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

(524)

The Speaker of the Legislative Council having submitted a proposition to the Committee for the augmentation of the Salary of the Librarian of that House, in the ratio of increase recently awarded to the Librarian of the Assembly, and this proposal having obtained the concurrence of the Members of the Committee representing the Legislative Council therein, the same was agreed upon.

Mr. *Taché*, from the Joint Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly for the direction of the Library of Parliament, presented to the House the Fourth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

The Committee have received from *John Langton*, Esquire, a Communication, a copy of which is herewith submitted, in reference to the Mission with which he was entrusted, under the Resolutions of both Houses last Session, to proceed to *Washington*, and to the neighbouring States to effect the interchange of Public Documents with this Province; and for other purposes connected with the Library. It is a subject of regret that unavoidable circumstances should have prevented Mr. *Langton* from carrying out the wishes of the Committee in this matter.

The Committee also beg leave to lay before the House, a copy of a Resolve of the Legislature of the State of *Maine*, dated March, 1855, but which has now, for the first time, been received, through Mr. *Langton* who was requested to take charge of the same by the Authorities of *Maine*. The Committee would recommend the adoption of Resolutions, by both Houses, in furtherance of the proposed exchange of Statutes and Parliamentary Documents with this State.

(Copy.)

Audit Office, *Toronto*, April 9th, 1856.

Sir, — I have the honor to report to you the result of the Mission with which I was entrusted by the Library Committee, and for the purposes of which a Warrant for Five hundred pounds was issued in my favor.

I left home in the month of July, for the purpose of proceeding to *Washington*, taking the Eastern States on my road, but when I had gone as far as *Boston*, I was necessarily recalled home, and a succession of sickness in my family, and latterly an accident to myself, prevented me fulfilling the wishes of the Committee until my acceptance of the Office of Auditor rendered it impossible for me to absent myself so long from the Province. I have therefore done really nothing in the matter entrusted to me. I visited the Seat of Government in the neighbouring States of *Maine*, *New Hampshire*, *Vermont*, and *Massachusetts*. I found a disposition on the part of the Executive Officers to make an arrangement for an interchange of Parliamentary Documents, but none of them had authority to make any definite agreement to that effect, except in the case of the State of *Maine*, where a Resolve had been passed at the last Session of the Legislature proposing such an interchange as we sought. I enclose a copy of this Resolve, which I understood had been forwarded, or was to be forwarded to you.

It would appear that the best course to pursue with regard to such of the adjoining States as we may wish to interchange with, would be to forward to them officially a Resolution of the Committee to ask their concurrence.

Having been thus unable to accomplish the most important part of the Commission of the Committee, it remains for me to ask your instructions how I am to dispose of the money at present lying in my name in the Bank of *Upper Canada*.

I have the honor to be,

Your obedient Servant,

The Honorable *L. V. Sicotte*,
Speaker.

(Signed,) *John Langton*.

(Copy.)

State of *Maine*.

Resolve for the exchange of documents.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby authorized and required to cause exchanges to be made with the Governments of *Canada* and *New Brunswick* of all the public documents of this State, in the same manner as is effected with the several States of the Union.

In the House of Representatives, March 17th, 1855, read and passed,

Sidney Perham, Speaker.

In Senate, March 17th, 1855, read and passed,

Franklin Muzzy, President.

March 17th, 1855, approved,

Anson P. Morrill.

Mr. *Taché*, from the Joint Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly for the direction of the Library of Parliament, presented to the House the Fifth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

In order to supply the place of Mr. *Langton*, in carrying out the views expressed in their Fourth Report, last Session, the Committee, upon the motion of the Honorable *John Ross*, have requested the Honorable *P.H. Moore*, a Member of the Legislative Council, to proceed to *Washington*, to *Louisiana*, and to certain border States of the *American Union*, for the purpose of organizing a system of exchange of the Laws, Journals, and Public Documents of the principal Legislatures of the *United States*, with this Province; and also, to procure for the Library such important Historical and Constitutional Works concerning *America*, as he may be unable to obtain by way of gift. Mr. *Moore* has consented to undertake this Mission, and the Committee trust that by his exertions, this portion of the Library may be rendered useful and complete.

The Official Publications which can be presented to the *American* Legislatures, in return for the Works we may receive from them, will, unavoidably, be few in number, and confined to those which have been issued within the last two years; the stocks on hand of the Journals and Papers of former years having been destroyed by Fire. The Committee consider, however, that so far as may be practicable, complete sets of the Revised Laws of *Lower* and *Upper Canada*, of the Statutes of *Canada*, and of the Journals and Papers of both Houses for the present Parliament, should be presented to those States with whom an exchange may be effected; together with any other Official Publications, or Books at the disposal of the Legislature. And in order to ensure a punctual delivery of these Books, the Committee recommend that the Clerk of the Legislative Council, and the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, do forward from time to time, such Official Publications, with any other Works available for this purpose, agreeably to the directions of the Committee, to be conveyed through their Secretary; and that the cost of the same be defrayed, proportionably, out of the Contingencies of both Houses.

Mr. *Fergusson*, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presented to the House the Eighteenth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have examined the Bill to alter the Survey of that part of the third Concession of *Onondaga*, commonly called *Martin's Bend*, and to confirm a new Survey thereof, and for other purposes, — and the Bill to incorporate certain persons under the name and style of the *Lake Huron Transit Company*; and have agreed to each of the Bills, with certain amendments, which they submit for the consideration of Your Honorable House.

They have considered the Bill to authorize the Trustees holding the Presbyterian Church in the Township of *Hull*, and the Lot upon which it is situated, to sell and convey the same, and to appropriate the proceeds to a like use; and they find the Preamble not proven, as it has not been shewn to them that a majority of the parties interested in the application is in favor of it.

The Honorable Mr. *Merritt*, from the Select Committee to which was referred the Petition of *Ira Schofield*, late Captain of the 2nd Regiment of *Leeds* Militia, during the War of 1812, presented to the House the Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

From the information received and evidence appended hereto, it appears that the Incorporated Militia, organized in 1813, were placed on half-pay shortly after the Peace of 1816.

(525)

(526)

That all other Provincial Corps and Flank Companies, some of whom were regularly enlisted and subject to Martial Law, others, under the Militia Laws of this Province, and although organized on a similar footing, served during a longer period, have not received a like mark of Royal favor.

Your Committee recommend the Petitioner, *Ira Schofield*, who served during the late War of 1812 in the Provincial and Flank Companies, in consideration of his gallant conduct and successful defence of this part of Her Majesty's dominions, now of great age, to the favorable consideration of Your Honorable House.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Colonel *McDonell*, Deputy Adjutant General of Militia, called in; and examined: —

1. How many Officers are still living of the Old Provincial Corps and Flank Companies who served in the late War of 1812? — By the Records of the Adjutant General's Office, I find that there were sixty-three Flank Companies, three Companies of Artillery, and five Troops of Militia Cavalry embodied and brought into active service in the field on the declaration of War in 1812, making in the whole, seventy-one Companies; and allowing three Officers to a Company, there would be attached to these Companies two hundred and thirteen Officers. Of the seventy-one Captains, forty-six are known to be deceased, leaving about a third, say twenty-five (most at a very advanced age,) and which might be considered a fair criterion by which to judge of the number of the survivors of the Subaltern Officers, and according to which there might appear to be about seventy survivors, in all, of the Officers of the Flank Companies, Artillery and Cavalry of 1812; but from the information derived from Members of Parliament and others from different parts of the Province, it is my opinion that the number living of all grades does not exceed fifty. It is also to be considered that some of the surviving Subalterns served afterwards in the Incorporated Militia and received half-pay.

2. What is the distinction between the Incorporated Militia who received half-pay in 1825, and these Corps? — The distinction between the Incorporated Militia who received half-pay in 1825, and the Flank Companies, Cavalry and Artillery, is this, that the Flank Companies, Cavalry and Artillery were formed under the provisions of the Militia Act, to serve while required during the War, by relieving a portion of the men from duty after a certain period of service, and keeping up the strength of the Companies by occasional drafts from the respective Battalions; and that the Incorporated Militia was raised only in 1813, to serve during the remainder of the War.

3. When were these different Corps, viz: Incorporated Militia, Provincial Corps, and Flank Companies organized, and how long did they serve? — The Battalion of the Incorporated Militia was raised only in 1813, to serve during the remainder of the War; the Provincial Corps that were raised in 1812, (Cavalry, Artillery and Drivers,) were enlisted and signed articles to serve during the War, and were subject to Martial Law; the Flank Companies, Cavalry and Artillery, were raised immediately on the declaration of War in 1812, and brought into the field for the defence of the Province, there being but one Regiment and seven Companies of Veterans in *Upper Canada*, at that period, and no Troops between *Kingston* and *Montreal*, and defended the Province during the first campaign, and served during the War.

Ordered, That the said Report be committed to a Committee of the whole House, for Monday next.

Ordered, That the said Report be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General, by *René Kimber*, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod: —

Mr. Speaker,

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honorable House in the Legislative Council Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Legislative Council Chamber:

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported, That agreeable to the commands of His Excellency the Governor General, the House had attended upon His Excellency in the Legislative Council Chamber, when His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's Name, the Royal Assent to the following Public and Private Bills: —

An Act to incorporate the *Buffalo* and *Lake Huron* Railway Company, with power to purchase from the *Buffalo*, *Brantford*, and *Goderich* Railway Company their line of Railway, and for other purposes.

An Act to provide in a more certain manner for order in Enregistration, and to facilitate Enregistrations and Searches in the Registry Offices of *Lower Canada*.

An Act to change the name of *George Byron Lyon* and of his family, by adding the name of *Fellowes*.

An Act to amend the *Lower Canada* Municipal and Road Act of 1855, and to authorize the organization of the Municipal Council in the Village of *St. Jérôme*.

An Act to enable the *Hamilton* Hotel Company to increase their Capital Stock, and for other purposes therein mentioned.

An Act to authorize the Court of Chancery, and the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, in *Upper Canada*, to admit *Henry Spencer Papps* to practise as a Solicitor and Attorney.

An Act for the punishment of the Officers and Servants of Railway Companies contravening the By-Laws of such Companies to the danger of person and property.

An Act to incorporate the *Ontario* Hotel Company.

An Act to separate the County of *Bruce* from the County of *Huron*.

An Act to naturalize *Hervey Killam*.

An Act to authorise *Henry Wulff Trigge*, Esquire, and others, to construct a Toll Bridge on the North-east Branch of the River *Nicolet*, near the Church of the Parish of *St. Monique*, in the County of *Nicolet*; and to incorporate the said *Henry Wulff Trigge* and others, under the name of the "*St. Monique* Bridge Company."

An Act to make further provision for the Geological Survey of this Province.

An Act to incorporate the Town of *Owen Sound*, in the County of *Grey*.

An Act to vest a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *Hamilton*, County of *Northumberland*, in *John Wade* and *Benjamin Seymour*.

An Act to amend the Provincial Act appropriating the moneys arising from the Clergy Reserves.

An Act to vest in *Samuel Doolittle* and *Robert Johnson* a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *Haldimand*.

An Act to incorporate the Town of *Galt*; and to define the limits thereof.

An Act to revive, continue, and amend the Act incorporating the *Hamilton* and *Port Dover* Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act relating to Savings Banks.

An Act to extend the line of the *Port Dalhousie* and *Thorold* Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to provide for the formation of Incorporated Joint Stock Companies for manufacturing, mining, mechanical, or chemical purposes.

An Act to amend the Common School Laws, and further to promote Elementary Education in *Lower Canada*.

An Act to vest in *James Taunton* a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *Southwold*.

An Act to vest in *John Farley*, the younger, a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *Darlington*.

An Act to amend the Acts imposing Duties of Customs.

An Act to amend the Act of Incorporation of the *L'Assomption* River and Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate certain persons under the name and style of the "*Canada* North-west Railway Company."

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the *Stratford* and *Huron* Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to *La Banque du Peuple*.

An Act to vest in *Daniel Burritt* a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *Marlborough*.

An Act to explain and amend the Charter of the *Brockville* Gas Light Company.

The Bill, intituled, "An Act to change the Constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering the same Elective," being then read;

It was His Excellency the Governor General's pleasure to say, that he reserved the Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's Pleasure thereon.

A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fennings Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery: —

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative council have passed the following Bills, without Amendment; viz: —

Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorize the Survey of the Broken front Concession of the Township of *Darlington*, and for other purposes:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide more effectual means for securing the payment of Constituted Rents and Life Rents:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend an Act for the qualification of Justices of the Peace:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to impose an additional Excise Duty on Spirits:" And also,

The Legislative Council have passed the Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the *Canada* and *Liverpool* Mining and Exploring Company," with several Amendments, to which they desire the concurrence of this House.

And then he withdrew.

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Morrison*,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

The House then resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, yesterday, proposed to be made to the proposed Amendment to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply);

(529) And which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, conveying to him the expression that the position which His Excellency's Administration have assumed up to the present day, on the Question of the Seat of Government, does not inspire this House with the confidence necessary to entrust the Administration with the moneys required for the construction of the necessary Buildings at the Seat of Government" inserted instead thereof;

And which Amendment to the said proposed Amendment was, That the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, conveying to him the expression that the position which His Excellency's Administration have assumed up to the present day, on the Question of the Seat of Government, does not inspire this House with the confidence necessary to entrust the Administration with the moneys required for the construction of the necessary Buildings at the Seat of Government" be left out, and the words "the course of the Administration with reference to the Seat of Government and other important Public Questions has disappointed the just expectations of the great majority of the People of this Province" inserted instead thereof.

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE then rose. The motion before the chair was, he said, distinctly a want of confidence in the present advisers [sic] of His Excellency. And with that motion, the hon. mover had associated the question of the Seat of Government — thereby hoping it was to be presumed, to draw to his side of the House any amount of support, which he would not otherwise receive. However, he would hold the motion as indicative of a want of confidence, and as such he would treat it, and so would his hon. colleagues. In introducing the amendment now before the House, the hon. member for Montreal [Mr. Holton] called the attention of hon. gentlemen to the circumstances under which the present Government had been formed. In fact, the most extensive range of topics had been taken during the debate. The conduct and character of the preceding administration, so well as the conduct and character of the members of the present Government, from its construction to the present time, were all reviewed. Now, he would enter into a short review of the formation and progress of the present administration. At the time of the formation of the present administration, great difficulties existed in the country. It might prove interesting to go into a history of these difficulties, but such a detail would prove anything but creditable to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. It would, he would repeat, prove anything but creditable to those hon. gentlemen who are eternally talking of the necessity of creating union in the

Reform party. He would, however, slightly review the formation of the present government. It was well known that in the month of June, 1854, Parliament was convened in Quebec. The Premier at that period was the Hon. Francis Hincks, now Governor of Barbadoes.¹ A combination of parties was formed and their united force² was then brought to bear against the Government, the result of which was a dissolution and an appeal to the country. In the month of September the Parliament was again assembled. And it would be well for those hon. gentlemen who professed an ardent desire for the continuance of a Government calculated to carry out a liberal policy, to look back to that time and mark the difficulties then existing. At that time that great party was strong, if united; but the difficulty was that it was not united, and from its very strength, split up into formidable sections. And whatever the cause of that division was, its effect was the weakening and final destruction of the Government. Hence arose the necessity³ for the formation of what was called the Coalition Government. It was the intrigues of the member for Lambton, who, without any disinterested motives on his part, had destroyed the Reform party, and shattered it to atoms, that led to the necessity of a union of the moderate men of both parties.⁴

MR. HOLTON. — Moderate men!⁵

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE would repeat most emphatically, moderate men — such men as were opposed to the extreme views of the hon. members for Lambton, Haldimand, and the North Riding of York. Perhaps he should except the latter hon. gentleman as he was a supporter of the Hincks Administration. He was under the impression, however, that that hon. gentleman had something to do with the destruction of the Administration in June. Now he would say that in 1854 — as the hon. member for Montreal had alluded to that period — an absolute necessity existed for the construction of the Coalition Administration, on account of the division in the Reform party. It was true the Coalition Government had been censured, but in being so, it only shared the fate of all Governments. A Coalition Government was not more liable to censure than any other Government. At the time this Government was called into existence, some of the greatest questions then agitating the country were jeopardised.⁶ There were the Clergy Reserves question, the Seigniorial Tenure question, Municipal Law in Lower Canada, ... [and] Legislative Council Bill⁷. The Reciprocity Treaty, too, had been passed, but had not then received the shape of law. And many other measures were also jeopardised.⁸ These questions have all been settled by the present Government, (ironical cheers.)⁹ Under these circumstances, when the hon. member for Lambton discoursed of the integrity of the Reform party, he (Mr. Spence) was at a loss whether to be astonished at that hon. gentleman's hardihood in making such assertions, or the extreme patience displayed by the House in listening to him. Who, he would ask, had done more to put the wedge into that very party, than any other man, if not the hon. member for Lambton? Among his supporters can that hon. gentleman now look round on a single individual of that party? Was it, then, becoming that hon. gentleman who had been so active in creating discord and dissension in that very party, to stand up and lecture that House as to the necessity for union, harmony, concord and integrity in the Reform party? As he [Mr. Spence] had before stated, the present Coalition Government was formed in 1854, and obtained the support of a large section of the Reform party. The hon. gentleman then contended that if ever the term Coalition was a misnomer, it was in this instance. The present Government was formed on a policy and subsisted on a policy up to the present moment. (Hear, hear.)¹⁰

MR. BROWN. — What is its policy?¹¹

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria)¹² [OR] MR. S. SMITH [Northumberland]. — Nothing.¹³

Cheers ... [from the] Opposition¹⁴.

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — But one week — nay, three days since, my hon. friend from Northumberland, with all the energy and ability of which he was capable, would have thrown up his cap for

the Administration.¹⁵ (Loud cheers).¹⁶ If he (Mr. Spence) was not convinced that the Government was not sustained — ¹⁷

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria)¹⁸ [OR] MR. S. SMITH [Northumberland]. — Tolerated, not sustained.¹⁹

Cheers from the opposition²⁰.

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE differed with the hon. member for Victoria and apologized for his mistake in attributing the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland to the hon. member for Victoria, if, indeed [sic], it was the latter hon. gentleman who had made the remark.²¹

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria). — It was I [who] said it.²²

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Well, then if the Government had been mistaken, it was not to be wondered at. Surely the Government had a right to draw on that hon. gentleman until they discovered him to be bankrupt, so far as their interest was concerned.²³ [OR] The Government had a right to believe that they had the confidence of the member for Victoria and the member for Northumberland, having had their support for 20 months.²⁴ But if they had withdrawn their favour from the Government, he could make no objection.²⁵ He had no unfriendly feelings towards that hon. gentleman [Mr. J. Smith] or any other hon. gentleman, who conscientiously supported a vote of want of confidence. And he would now state, as he had before stated on more than one occasion, that when that House unhesitatingly declares it has no confidence in the Administration, he should not be found wanting in pursuing the only proper and honorable course under the circumstances. (Hear, hear.)²⁶

MR. S. SMITH (Northumberland). — Go on that way!²⁷

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — And whatever may be the fate of the Government — whether it shall be defeated to-night, or continue for another day or month — there is one thing which, at least, they can lay claim to, and that is that they have been the instruments in effecting the final and satisfactory settlement of the most troublesome and longest vexed questions ever agitating this country. The hon. gentleman then contended at great length that the Government were entitled to all the credit of the settlement of the Clergy Reserves question.²⁸ (Ironical cheers.)²⁹ He would say that those hon. gentlemen who affected to think the settlement of this question a small matter (cheers) — ³⁰

MR. MURNEY. — The Clergy Reserves is not the question (order — hear, hear) — ³¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — The hon. member for Hastings is out of order (chair, chair.) If the hon. gentleman wishes to reply, he must wait till the hon. Postmaster General has resumed his seat.³²

MR. MURNEY. — As a member of the Administration (loud cries of chair, chair, and confusion) — Mr. Speaker would you please read the motion before the chair?³³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — The hon. member is out of order in interrupting the hon. Postmaster General to ask the reading of the motion.³⁴

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE resumed by stating that the Ministry were entitled to the greatest credit for the Clergy Reserve Bill.³⁵

MR. MURNEY. — The next election will tell that tale. (Order, order.)³⁶

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE hoped the hon. member for Hastings would preserve a little more order.³⁷ The Clergy Reserves question ... had been a social and political evil³⁸. Generations had passed

away since this question was first agitated in the country. The young and active spirits of the present day were the first to hear of its final settlement. Would any hon. gentleman venture to state that that was not a cause of rejoicing, in that House and in the country? Some £330,000 brought up all the claims of the incumbent, and this year, £318,000 would be available for municipal purposes, and next year he believed that upwards of £100,000 would be available.³⁹ Besides that nearly a million acres of land still remained to be disposed of for their benefit.⁴⁰ The great and most promising feature in this settlement was that it had been concurred in by the moderate Conservatives; and it was now placed on such a basis that it could never be disturbed; and the ironical cheers f[r]om the members on the other side of the House, which they always heard when the settlement of this question was alluded to, arose from the knowledge that what had been so long a political stalking-horse to power was now done away with.⁴¹ And this question had been satisfactorily settled with the concurrence of a large portion of the population. Passing from that question the hon. member for Montreal [Mr. Holton] went on to speak of the incapacity of the present Administration, in reference to the management of their department[s]. He [Mr. Spence] thought he was correct in saying that the words made use of by the hon. member for Montreal, on that occasion, were that the present Administration, either from their incapacity or imbecility, were unfit to hold the reins of office. Now when, as on the present occasion, a Government was placed on its trial, he thought that the charges should be of a more specific nature. Charges of so broad and comprehensive a nature ought not to be put forward on grounds like the present. Nothing had been adduced to support either charges. Nor were they, he would add, credited by that House.⁴² With reference to this attack on the departments, he would say that the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands had on a recent occasion very ably defended the management of his department, and so had the hon. Inspector General⁴³. With reference to his own department — for he did not remember that any department with the exception of these three had been alluded to last evening — he (Mr. Spence) would say that only one charge had been brought against that department, and that was that the balance, or debit of the department was twice as much this year as it had been before and that its monetary affairs were not managed according to the views of the hon. member for Montreal. Now, if that gentleman had thought proper to inquire into the peculiarity of the management required in the Post-office Department, he would have altogether changed his opinions. That department was one very peculiar in its character. It[s] expenses could not be accurately calculated. It was, in fact, the measure of the prosperity of the country, and as such, it was impossible to fix its expenses within bounds, at the commencement. (Hear, hear.) In 1851,⁴⁴ the Post Office Department was transferred from the Imperial Government to their Government. At that time it was paying a revenue,⁴⁵ and would have continued so still if it had not kept pace with the wants and requirements of a growing, prosperous country. (Hear, hear.) It then owed nothing and had a *prestige* attached to it, from the efficiency of the excellent officer at its head. In 1852, the department had accumulated a large debt, although it had received a grant of £20,000. In 1853 this debt was still further increased, and a similar increase took place in the succe[ess]ing year.⁴⁶ They continued year after year to extend the facilities of letters by opening new routes and new Post Offices, which had greatly increased the expense of the department, while the rates of postage had been reduced one-third. Was it any wonder that under those circumstances the department had become indebted to the extent of £26,000?⁴⁷ Now, in regard to the aid to this department he could not conceive what difference there could be in the Bank of Upper Canada affording the Post Office the necessary funds, or being obliged to receive the money from the Inspector General. He was prepared to show vouchers for every 6d which was expended in that department, and no contracts were entered into without first being advertised. Such being the case, he could not see how any just censure could lie at the door of that department — more especially so, when its operations were conducted in strict conformity with the principle of the act of its constitution. Now, he unhesitatingly stated that such was the case. What room was there for the application of the hon. member for Montreal's terms imbecility or corruption? None whatever. Why the increased expenditure had taken place, he would now proceed to state. If the policy which obtained in this department before 1851 had prevailed since then no doubt, it might be made a source of revenue. And if this House would now determine that the Postmaster General shall not change the old

conveyance for the more modern stage coach, or railroad car, it might be made a source of profit. If not, it was out of the question to expect that such could be [the] case. The growth of the country must undoubtedly increase the expense of the Post Office department. They had now lines of postal accommodation opened up, extending from 100 to 200 miles, which did not pay its pound of cost. But still they were maintained; for we held the maintenance of such accommodation to be implied in the Post Office contract with the mercantile and commercial men of the country, in order to enable them to carry on their correspondence. That correspondence had to be carried from the large cities to the smallest villages in the country.⁴⁸ The Government holds that it is not a duty to confine the operations of the Department to the great cities. If it were confined to them, the Department would be a source of revenue. But ... they believe that wherever a blacksmith's shop, a store, and the indication of a settlement are visible, it is their bounden duty to increase the comfort, the spread of intelligence, and the real benefits of a postal department to every such locality.⁴⁹ And if it was the wish of the House, the postal communication would be still further increased, with proportionate advantage to the country.⁵⁰ The House has decreed that the postage on newspapers should be abolished, and has thus added largely to the expenses, without providing any means to meet those expenses. The House has decreed that the postage on letters should not be increased. An increase of 30 per cent would give a revenue. But this is a question that remains alone with the House.⁵¹ Another cause of the debit in this department was the large increase in the percentage of the officers' salaries. In 1851, the salaries of the officers were about 20 per cent. on the entire postage. Now, it was about 50 per cent. In replying to a question from some hon. gentleman opposite, the hon. Postmaster General stated that although the present remuneration attached to the office of Post Master was not very great, still there was no office under the Government sought after with greater avidity; for it was an office of influence and honor. The remuneration attached to the office was, generally, in proportion to the duty required of the incumbent. The next source of expense to the department came under the head of contracts; and he had only to mention that matter in order to satisfy every hon. gentleman, that a large additional increase was required to carry them on. They were now 50 per cent. higher than they were a short time since. Nor was it to be wondered at, for every thing had risen proportionately. (Hear, hear.)⁵² [But although] the expense of living has increased enormously within the last four years, ... the rates of postage have not increased in the slightest degree.⁵³ The railway service now cost the department from £10,000 to £12,000 — yet that did not relieve them from other services. Yet another cause of the decrease in the revenue, was the telegraphic communication. That was a serious deduction from the postal revenue, and went a great way in accounting for the deficit of £26,000. Again, had not the department largely involved itself by freeing newspapers from postage? And were they not entitled to credit for that? It had trebled the circulation of newspaper literature of the country. Would that fact carry no satisfaction [sic] to the honorable member for Lambton, the honorable member for Haldimand, and other honorable gentlemen in the House⁵⁴? His [Mr. Spence's] predecessor in office had relieved from postage papers published in the interests of temperance and agriculture; this Government has made all papers free of postage, irrespective of their character.⁵⁵ It was, he contended, a great educational movement. The honorable gentleman after a brief reference to the improvement effected in abolishing the absurd system previously adopted of keeping the accounts of the departments of Government, went on to state that the whole postage of the House, of His Excellency the Governor General, the Civil Secretary, the Inspector, the Law Department, and all the higher departments, was transmitted at the expense of the Post Office Department. And in addition to these improvements, a uniform system of registration had been introduced, which had worked remarkably well. A money-order system had also been introduced, by which one hundred and twenty places in the Province where there were no banks, were afforded banking facilities.⁵⁶ In spite of all these considerations, the Department is charged with imbecility and corruption, because there is a deficit of £26,000. He must confess his astonishment that the member for Montreal should make these charges without instancing a single case as proof.⁵⁷ [Mr. Spence] then strongly advocated a broad and liberal policy for the Post Office Department, as the best calculated to develop the usefulness of the system, and benefit the country at large. As an instance of the rapid increase of the facilities afforded by this department, the

hon. gentleman alluded to the fact that in 1851 the Post offices in Canada numbered only 600, whereas they now number 1,400; and this year a line of 2,000 miles not previously travelled by rail cars had been opened up.⁵⁸ Is not the Department, in reality, deserving of commendation for endeavoring to extend its operations in proportion to the increase of population throughout the Province, instead of being chargeable with imbecility and corruption? The member for Montreal had made the charge against⁵⁹ the Attorney General West, the Speaker of the Council, and himself, (Mr. S.)⁶⁰ that they had entered into a conspiracy for the purpose of removing the Premier. He heard that charge with regret, and the member for Montreal could scarcely have been conscious of the fact that in the heat of the debate he was inflicting a stroke on the fair fame of⁶¹ one of his (Mr. Holton's) most intimate friends,⁶² the Speaker of the Legislative Council. He denied that there was any conspiracy. He denied that there was any desire to sacrifice their friend, the late Speaker of the Council. That gentleman had resolved, of his free will, to retire from the administration, and did retire, in spite of the solicitations of his friends to remain among them. He left them as a friend, and continued still on terms of friendship with his late colleagues. He had not entered into any conspiracy with them to remove the premier, nor had they sacrificed that gentleman.⁶³ [The charge] made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke against the Administration,⁶⁴ of not having reformed the public departments was unfair, as the heads of departments have been too much engaged in their parliamentary duties, to make changes in their official arrangements.⁶⁵ Taking into account the three sessions which had taken place since their advent to power and the delay and confusion consequent on the removal from Quebec — everything had been done in the various departments of the Administration, which could be possibly expected. With reference to the assertion of the hon. member from Essex that the Administration never received a vote of confidence from the House, he would say that that confidence in the acts of the Administration had been tendered in the only way it could possibly be — by large majorities of that House.⁶⁶ The Ministry had received four votes of confidence this session, and hoped to receive a fifth to-night.⁶⁷ The last vote of confidence they had received was on the introduction into the Cabinet of the hon. member for Niagara.⁶⁸

MR. S. SMITH. — An Upper Canada majority was then against you.⁶⁹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — If his memory served him right such was not the case on that occasion. (Hear, hear.) He was aware the hon. member for Hastings did not give them his confidence upon that occasion.⁷⁰

MR. MURNEY. — Not the slightest.⁷¹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said he could only understand whether they possessed the confidence of the House by taking the "votes and proceedings," and he was safe in saying they had a majority of six or seven Upper Canada members upon that occasion.⁷²

MR. MURNEY. — A question of private character.⁷³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE did not know anything about these secret reservations; but the member for Hastings at least had no reason to complain if he construed this into a vote of confidence, for that gentleman had not given the ministry the slightest portion of his confidence.⁷⁴ He [Mr. Spence] could not understand what the hon. member for Essex meant when he said they were not votes of confidence. The Government would stand or fall by the votes of this House, and if they lose the confidence of the House they would give way to better men, but if upon the present occasion they have the majority, it will not be fair for the hon. member for Essex to say that it is not a vote of confidence. The only parallel to such a line of argument, would be such a one as that exhibited by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, who, in voting for the Seat of Government to be permanent at Quebec, said he did not mean that they should go to Quebec. Though he declared that Quebec was the proper place and that there should be an

appropriation for public buildings there, yet he has discovered that he did not mean the Seat of Government should be there. The hon. member for Sherbrooke said he was very much embarrass[ed] by his vote.⁷⁵

MR. GALT. — Not by my vote, but by the act of the Administration.⁷⁶

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — The hon. gentleman says the Government embarrassed him; but how did it embarrass him? Was it by giving effect to his expressed wish? Was it by taking him at his word? and by believing that when that hon. gentleman said yea, he meant yea. There was another point to which he would allude. The Government [sic] asked, tauntingly, what was the policy of the Administration? He would ... say that one bill passed this session — although there had been no other — the General Incorporations Bill — not only showed the liberality of sentiment of the hon. gentleman who introduced it, but marked the wisdom of the legislation of this session, and if they had carried through no other measure, that was of itself sufficient to mark the importance of this session (hear, hear). But that bill interferes with the agitators of the country. There are those who do not like to see these general measures. There are those who would like to see such questions as the Clergy Reserves standing in the way to keep asunder those who would cordially meet and co-operate for the general good of the country. Such measures meet not with the hearty concurrence of the hon. member for Lambton, and those who act with him.⁷⁷ There are individuals at the present day who possess feelings similar to those of him who we are told “fiddled while Rome was burning.” The member for Lambton, too, would fiddle over the ruins of his country⁷⁸ (hear, hear). He would keep the people divided as he has kept them since 1851 to the present time, if he could make it at all conducive to his own benefit. He was not imagining a case.⁷⁹ The member for Lambton has assailed every distinguished Reformer who has appeared in this country — the member for Norfolk, who was more bitterly assailed than him;⁸⁰ [the] hon. member for N. York⁸¹; Mr. Baldwin, who was bribed and insulted, and the country insulted through him⁸²; the honorable Mr. Cameron, the honorable Mr. Hincks. Was not that gentleman goaded, maligned and prosecuted? Was not the country insulted through the insults that were heaped upon that honorable gentleman. He had no objection to honorable gentlemen’s opposition, but what was the course of that honorable gentleman in 1851, when the honorable Mr. Baldwin with that refinement of feeling for which he is characterized, bowed to what he considered the sense of the House in the Court of Chancery question? Who gloried over that more than the honorable member for Lambton? Did he endeavor to unite the party at that time? Did he gather up the fragments that nothing might be lost? No, he interposed to prevent any union;⁸³ [he] gloated over the discussions and distractions of his country, as they enabled him to prosper in his own vocation.⁸⁴ But these exciting questions which then agitated the party and agitated the country have all been settled, and that honorable gentleman’s occupation was gone. We have no more Clergy Reserves, no more theoretical views of responsible Government, no more bad assessment laws to croak over. There is at present not one question of grievance that has not been the creation of the honorable member for Lambton, and yet that gentleman has admitted the utter impracticability of attempting to make his views effective.⁸⁵

MR. BROWN wished to correct the honorable gentleman but was prevented.⁸⁶

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said the honorable member for Lambton had a right to make such explanations as he thought proper. The honorable gentleman told the House that he (Mr. Spence,) was incorrect in regard to the circulation of some heads of petitions, although he was confident that he was stating what was the fact; yet he stood corrected, as he felt there might be some mistake. He could now however point to the gentleman in this House to whom the honorable member for Lambton crossed the floor and gave those petitions. (Name, name.)⁸⁷

MR. BROWN rose and gave a contradiction to the statement, calling on the speaker to name the member alluded to.⁸⁸

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE:] Dr. Cook, the member for South Oxford. (Hear, hear.) He had no doubt the honorable member for Lambton knew all about it. (Hear.)⁸⁹

MR. BROWN again denied the statement.⁹⁰

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE proceeded:] He differed with the honorable member for Lambton, and had done since 1851, but he had no wish to misrepresent that gentleman. He had charged him (Mr. Spence) with not having reported him correctly [sic] in regard to his being a governmental impracticability. He had endeavored [sic] to give the spirit of the hon. gentleman's remarks. His words were that he was a governmental impossibility. The hon. gentleman occupies a distinguished position in Her Majesty's opposition. But what is the harmony of that Opposition? The effort is to break down the Government. The hon. member for Lambton says we have no policy. But he would say that every measure upon which the Government was formed had been successfully carried through. The Opposition have not shown any better policy. They have not shown any policy of that homogenous character of which we heard last night. Does the hon. member for Lambton accord with the hon. member for Hastings, or the hon. member for Haldimand, or the hon. the commercial member for Montreal? Did not that hon. gentleman record his vote against the Legislative Council Bill, the greatest measure of the Session, and yet he talks about the harmony that exists? He did not impugn the policy of hon. members on the other side, but if they play the game of government breaking as some of them have been doing for several years, the country has to pay the piper.⁹¹ The country does now pay the piper, for here in the fourteenth week of the session the time of the House is again occupied with a discussion on the policy of the Government, which has already been discussed and explained over and over again.⁹² The hon. gentleman here referred to certain statements made, connected with the Halton election of 1851 and the Wentworth election of 1854.⁹³ He had been personally attacked repeatedly, and had been charged with having deserted the principles of a platform offered to him in 1851. He had been charged with having opposed the Hincks administration in 1854, and he would trouble the House for a moment by reading a letter from Mr. Miller, the gentleman by whom he was opposed in 1854. That gentleman, after the debate in the House in February last, in which these charges were made against him for the first time, saw them reported in the *Globe*, and immediately wrote to him, stating that although they were opponents at the election of 1854, he felt it due to him to state that he (Mr. S.) had never expressed any political views adverse to those which Mr. Miller himself held, nor any opposition to the Government of Mr. Hincks. He had also received a letter from Mr. Tunis, of Flamborough, informing him that he had met Mr. David Christie at Hamilton, and, as that gentleman had enquired whether he was not present when the Halton platform was presented to Mr. Spence, and whether Mr. Spence had not accepted it; he thought it due to him (Mr. Spence) to state that he remembered distinctly that he had refused to bind himself by that platform. He had, also, received a letter from Mr. Dickson, who informed him that, having seen various attacks made on him in the *Globe*, in consequence of the alleged desertion of the Halton platform, he took that means of testifying that, not only had he not accepted that platform, but had pointed out certain portions of it which he disclaimed as his political creed. He thought it necessary to trouble the House by reading these letters, as the assertions made by the member for Lambton had been calculated to injure him politically, and to injure him in the estimation of his friends. The member for Lambton had had this information put in his possession, and, as a gentleman, was bound to give him the benefit of it. That hon. gentleman had not done so, but he hoped that he had satisfied that honorable gentleman.⁹⁴

MR. BROWN. — Not by a great deal.⁹⁵

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE hoped that at least he had satisfied those friends who had acted with him since the formation of this ministry, that these letters contradicted, as far as contradiction could go, the statements of hon. gentlemen in regard to his course upon that occasion.⁹⁶

Loud ministerial cheers, and clapping of hands.⁹⁷

Six o'clock having come, the house adjourned.⁹⁸

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the chair shortly after half-past 7 o'clock.⁹⁹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE resumed his remarks. He said, he had stated before the recess, on the authority of the member for South Oxford, that the member for Lambton had crossed the floor of the house, and placed in the hands of that hon. member, printed headings of petitions, with the request that he would circulate them in his own county.¹⁰⁰

MR. BROWN. — Petitions for what?¹⁰¹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said, he found he had been mistaken as regarded the nature of the petitions.¹⁰²

Hear, hear, by MR. BROWN.¹⁰³

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE continued:] The honorable gentleman need not halloo till he gets out of the wood. He [Mr. Spence] had the authority of the honorable member for Oxford for making the statement. (Hear, hear.)¹⁰⁴ He had made the statement in good faith. His argument was that the member for Lambton had himself stirred up disaffection through the country, and he gave as an instance, that he had been instrumental in getting up petitions on the Separate School question. And his mistake was, that the petitions were not about Separate Schools, but about Representation by Population.¹⁰⁵

MR. BROWN. — That was not your argument. Your argument was this¹⁰⁶ — (Spoke, spoke.)¹⁰⁷

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said he would not be interrupted. (Oh, oh.) His argument was that the people were not dissatisfied with the political condition of things, and he charged the member for Lambton with encouraging agitation in the country,¹⁰⁸ and in proof of the assertion stated that he took the trouble to circulate petitions and scatter them broadcast over the country. That that honorable gentleman had circulated petitions on the Separate School question. Does that honorable gentleman say he did not give the honorable member for Oxford those petition[s]?¹⁰⁹ The member for Oxford would say whether it was or was not. The only difference was, that the petitions were on the subject of representation by population, and not of sectarian schools.¹¹⁰ Now what was the mighty difference between that, and petitions about Representation — petitions to convince the Upper Canadians that one man in Upper Canada was as good as a man in Lower Canada, and that the people of Lower Canada, sunk in sloth and ignorance, were governing the people of Upper Canada? And the member for Lambton had made another statement, in pointing out the unfitness of the men composing the present Government for their offices. He said there were men in the Government, no doubt, with strong convictions, but they could not carry them out. What authority had the member for Lambton for saying, that effect had not been given to his (Mr. Spence's) own opinions, or to the opinions of the Attorney General, or to the opinions of the Commissioner of Crown Lands?¹¹¹ He [Mr. Spence] could assert that there had been no subsidence of opinion in the Administration. But he was surprised at such a statement when he recollected the opinion expressed by that hon. gentleman in regard to the Commissioner of Crown Lands.¹¹² What were formerly the personal relations of the member for Lambton with the present Commissioner of Crown Lands, whom he would now hold up as the embodiment of Lower Canadian priestcraft? Had the member for Lambton forgotten that he was the individual who conceived he was doing honour to himself in escorting the

member for Montmorenci through the western part of Upper Canada, and showing him off in the town of Brantford, as the embodiment of Lower Canadian Liberalism?¹¹³

MR. BROWN. — It's all stuff.¹¹⁴

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Of course it's all stuff — but it was the right political bunkum stuff at that time. The hon. member for Lambton told the people of Brantford that the Commissioner of Crown Lands was the individual to whom they were indebted for the liberality of their legislation.¹¹⁵ The member for Lambton would then have been willing to worship the whole Lower Canadian party, for it suited his purpose to do so.¹¹⁶ It was then profitable to support the Administration, and the hon. member for Lambton was then rioting in the spoils of the public chest, as the public accounts can testify.¹¹⁷ Then the member for Lambton attempted to make a great deal out of the North Shore Railroad, and adduced it as a strong argument why the Government should no longer possess the confidence of the country.¹¹⁸ What is there so very objectionable in that bill? If they can succeed in getting a road built from the Ottawa to Lake Huron by a grant of land now valueless, what harm can there be in that? The people of Upper Canada are too intelligent to be taken in by such clap-trap as that.¹¹⁹ If every other square mile of land was given for the construction of the railroad, would not the remaining land along the route be increased in value ten or fifty fold?¹²⁰ [He would] support that measure, as ... they had a sufficient guarantee in the fact that unless 25 miles of railway were constructed from Pembroke to the West or from Lake Huron to the East no land would be given them¹²¹, and he hoped they might have plenty of railroads built in that manner.¹²² The member for Lambton a short time ago expressed great astonishment at an inaccuracy of his, (Mr. Spence's) in regard to the amount of the population at the time of the Union, when he stated that the population of Upper Canada was 400,000 and that of Lower Canada, nearly a million. But what was the accuracy of the hon. member himself? Last night the hon. member for Lambton laid great emphasis on 16 millions of dollars of the funds of the Province being engulfed in the Grand Trunk Railroad.¹²³

MR. BROWN. — How much is it?¹²⁴

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Taking a lesson from the hon. member for Haldimand, the hon. member converted pounds into dollars, and spoke of sixteen millions of dollars. Now the whole amount is £3,III,500.¹²⁵

MR. BROWN. — Currency or sterling?¹²⁶

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE, after consultation with his colleagues, admitted it was sterling.¹²⁷

MR. BROWN. — Well, how many dollars is that? The hon. gentleman had better go back to school. (Laughter.)¹²⁸

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said he would not go back to school, and proceeded to criticize the motion before the house. He said it was substantially the same as that of the member for L'Assomption.¹²⁹ It had been moved in amendment by Mr. Holton to a motion by Mr. Papin in order that if the motion should carry, Mr. Holton might be the person to be sent for by the Governor to form a new government, as being a more responsible person to carry on a government.¹³⁰

MR. ROBINSON. — The leadership of the member for L'Assomption lasted quite as long as usual.¹³¹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — I wonder who is leader of the opposition to-night?¹³²

MR. S. SMITH. — Will the Postmaster General tell us who is at present the leader of the Government? (Laughter.)¹³³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE complained that the motion was not sufficiently precise in its terms,¹³⁴ and contended that the hon. gentlemen opposite were afraid to test the House upon the simple question of *confidence* or *no* in the Administration, but had to drag in the question of the Seat of Government.¹³⁵ He presumed that had been introduced into it to give a weight to the motion, which it would not have had otherwise. For the opposition themselves knew that the Government did possess the confidence of the country. (Oh! oh! and laughter.)¹³⁶

MR. MURNEY. — The Government have not even confidence in themselves. (Hear, hear.)¹³⁷

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE continued:] They had been charged with unfitness, but that hon. gentleman [Mr. Brown] had not shown he had a peculiar fitness for carrying on the government, and if he [Mr. Spence] had a desire stronger than another to hold office, it would be to keep out such men as the hon. member for Lambton. If indeed those friends who have generously supported us hitherto in our efforts to carry on a fair, even and impartial government in this country, feel that they have now confidence in the hon. member for Lambton, and have therefore transferred their feelings to the hon. member for Lambton¹³⁸, then they might vote for this motion. He had no hesitation in saying that the member for Lambton was the most distinguished member on the Opposition benches, and no one denied his ability, or his untiring efforts for the consolidation of his party. If those hon. members, then, to whom he alluded, were prepared to adopt the platform of that hon. member, and to go the length of carrying out his views as to the permanency of the Union,¹³⁹ it is not very wonderful that they no longer were prepared to support the present Administration. Far more honorable would it be for them [the Ministry] to retire into private life¹⁴⁰ or to take ... [their] place in opposition¹⁴¹, than to feel that they were put on a par with the hon. member for Lambton. They did desire most certainly to perpetuate this Union. They did not entertain the idea of its disturbance. They did not come forward and say if this measure or that be not carried the Union must be broken up. He believed that that man would be a martyr in politics who would look upon the maintenance of the Union as problematical — the Union must be maintained.¹⁴² In reference to the Seat of Government, he had not taken a course like that of the honourable member for Sherbrooke, who voted for its being permanently fixed at Quebec, and then declared that the Government had embarrassed the house, by asking for an appropriation to carry out that vote.¹⁴³ If the House chose to rescind its own vote on the Seat of Government, the Ministry were not responsible; they must act upon the vote as it stood¹⁴⁴, [and] seeing that this House instructed the Government that they should go to Quebec, they have placed in the estimates a sum to carry out the wishes of this House.¹⁴⁵

MR. J. SMITH. — Not to carry out your own convictions.¹⁴⁶

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE did not know what the hon. gentleman's convictions were, but he (Mr. Spence) was the best judge of what his own motives were, and he asked no man to put constructions upon them. The Government had made this an open question from the first, and he voted against Quebec, but as a member of that Government he yielded to the wishes of the hon. member for Victoria and other hon. members, and assented to that sum being placed in the estimates. He had only further to say, that while they had labored to the best of their ability to carry out those pledges which they gave when this government was formed, and which he was happy to say they had accomplished, the[y] had endeavored to consolidate the best interests of the country — to effect peace — to maintain a good and clear understanding between the people of both sections of the Province, to extinguish, if possible, that bitterness of feeling which previously existed, and they were enabled to boast that during their Government all party spirit in Upper Canada has ceased. It was to them a matter of gratification¹⁴⁷ that the

party lines which have hitherto kept moderate men apart from each other have been removed, and that they may now¹⁴⁸ meet together and blend their best energies for the production of the greatest possible good to the greatest number. If the time has arrived when they could no longer be useful in administering the affairs of the Government, then to-night they would understand it by an unequivocal vote of this House. Although he did not admire the way in which the motion was drawn up, although, in his opinion it would have been more independent in the opposition, not to have dragged in the question of the Seat of Government — yet they desired their friends to understand this as a vote of confidence or no confidence in the administration, and they would bow to the decision.¹⁴⁹ He trusted that hon. members would weigh well the statements of the member for Lambton, that they would reflect upon his own admission that he is a governmental [impossibility].¹⁵⁰ If hon. gentlemen were convinced that the hon. member for Lambton — the leader [sic] of the opposition — although in his own modesty he ignores that position to which his talents entitle him to aspire — and these associated with him will form a stronger Government — a Government that will impart more confidence to this house and to the country, it will be for this house by their vote to determine¹⁵¹, and he and his colleagues would resign in favour of that hon. member.¹⁵²

MR. BROWN said he might have another opportunity of replying to the general arguments of the Postmaster General, but he desired now to offer a word of explanation on the remarks which had been made personal to himself. There were four points on which the Postmaster General had laid stress. In the first place he said that he (Mr. B.) had gone on a tour through the west to exhibit the member for Montmorenci. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman certainly was not very complimentary to his hon. colleague, in the way he presented it. But the fact was that he (Mr. B.) was not a party at all to the exhibition of that hon. gentleman. A public dinner was given at Brantford to the Hon. Malcolm Cameron, as a compliment for the exertions he had put forth in making Brantford the county town. He (Mr. B.) was invited to the dinner, and made a speech at it, and it so happened that Mr. Cauchon was also present, and that was the whole he knew of the tour of the hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.) The second point made by the Postmaster General was that he never *signed* the platform of 1851, containing all those Radical doctrines which he now wished so much to repudiate. The charge was not whether he signed it or not, but that he *assented* to it. Now a letter of the chairman of that convention had been published, in which he declared positively that the hon. gentleman assented to it. And what was more, he believed he was correct in saying, that a document declaring that the statement of the hon. gentleman on this subject on a previous occasion in this house was totally incorrect, had been signed by 15 or 16 persons present at that convention.¹⁵³ That papers [sic] affirms that the charge made is true in all its particulars.¹⁵⁴ He hoped to have this document, and to lay it before the house, before the vote was taken. (Hear, hear.) Then the Postmaster General brought an accusation against him of having mis-stated facts. "How loose," he said, "was the member for Lambton in his statements! He stated that the debt of the Grand Trunk Railway, for which the Province was made liable, was 16 million[s] of dollars, while in fact it is only somewhat over three millions of pounds." (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman actually fancied it was three millions currency, instead of sterling. The hon. gentleman sat there as a Minister of the Crown, and did not know within a million of pounds, the amount of that Grand Trunk debt! Then the honourable gentleman brought it, as a grave accusation of untruth against him, that on a previous occasion, when the School question was under discussion, he [Mr. Brown] made the statement that he had never circulated petitions on the subject of Sectarian Schools. And now he [Mr. Spence] shifted his ground, and said the charge was that the member for Lambton had excited the country by petitions, not upon the School question, but upon Representation.¹⁵⁵

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said the charge was that the member for Lambton had excited the country by petition, and what was the difference whether it was on the school question or on Representation by Population.¹⁵⁶

MR. BROWN said the charge was that he (Mr. B.) had made a deliberate mis-statement, when he asserted that no petition had been circulated by him on the subject of Sectarian Schools. Mr. Brown proceeded to read from the Debates of the 6th [sic] of May¹⁵⁷, to show that that was the precise issue raised, the Postmaster General having then attempted to account for the large number of petitions against Separate Schools, by asserting that printed petitions were circulated through the country by Mr. Brown and his friends, an assertion to which those gentlemen gave a flat contradiction. He had sent a note on the subject to the hon. member for South Oxford, and learned that he had made the statement on which Mr. Spence proceeded, but having found out his mistake, had intended to take the first opportunity of setting the matter right before the House. Yet the Postmaster General, when he rose after the recess, having in the meantime learned the real facts, instead of withdrawing the whole statement as utterly unfounded, had cunningly attempted to shift the issue, and repeated it in another form. (Hear, hear.)¹⁵⁸

MR. S. SMITH said it was well known, and the Postmaster General had put it correctly to-night, that till within a short time past he had been as warm a supporter of the administration as they had in the house. And he considered it necessary, therefore, to make a few explanations, purely personal, and referring to his own position. The Postmaster General would recollect that he opposed one of the Government measures — the Militia Bill, at its every stage, last session. On the question of salaries, also, the Government had met with his earnest opposition. Perhaps he had partly become responsible for those measures by afterwards supporting the administration this session. But the Postmaster General might make any capital out of that he chose. If he had been wrong in supporting the administration after they had passed those measures, of course it was wrong in the Government to pass them. But he had now good reasons for opposing the present administration.¹⁵⁹

MR. A. MORRISON. — Name them!¹⁶⁰

[MR. S. SMITH:] He had said that he would support the administration until they had forfeited his confidence, — well they had forfeited his confidence, and for that reason he now opposes them. And he does so not in sorrow but in anger.¹⁶¹

MR. A. MORRISON. — Thank you, thank you.¹⁶²

MR. S. SMITH. — Oh, the member for North Simcoe will thank his constituents when he goes back to them, and they will thank him to go about his business for having voted to take the Government down to Quebec.¹⁶³

MR. A. MORRISON. — And what about your constituents?¹⁶⁴ [They] will send you off, at any rate.¹⁶⁵

MR. S. SMITH. — Perhaps they would, on account of his having so long supported the present administration. (Laughter.) He was quite willing to make a clean breast of it, and to admit that he had grossly erred in having given so warm a support to the administration. He would say this, however, in justification of himself — the Postmaster General having claimed him as one of the warmest supporters of the administration, and as throwing up his cap with the greatest satisfaction at everything they did — that during this session he had opposed the Government on the vital question of the Rectories, although some other Reformers on that occasion voted with them.¹⁶⁶ In the discussion of the rectories, he began to lose confidence in them; as the hon. member for Niagara seemed to take the whole burden of that question on his own shoulders. His vote was not given for the administration upon that occasion, because he did not approve of their policy — if they had any.¹⁶⁷ And had he been in the house when the question arose as to the member for Niagara going back to his constituents, on taking the office of an Executive Councillor, he would have voted against the Government, as did his hon. friend from Peterboro. The

course of the administration on that occasion formed one of the reasons why he lost confidence in them¹⁶⁸. The Postmaster General would remember that a deputation of the Reformers of this House waited upon him, and told him — What? To resign! No! That he had their entire confidence! If so, there was no reason for their going at all. That gentleman¹⁶⁹ [made] the extraordinary declaration ... that he would cling to office till the bricks of the tumbling house fell about his ears. (Hear, hear.) These things were not of themselves sufficient to send him [Mr. Smith] into opposition, but they made him think of taking that course, contrary to his own wishes, for he would have liked to remain in alliance with the government, and he did not break with them for anything they had done to him personally, or refused to him.¹⁷⁰ When the constitutional question came upon the motion of the Attorney General,¹⁷¹ how many reform supporters of the Postmaster General voted with him on that occasion? Only Messrs. Church and Daly.¹⁷² The Government had a majority against them of six from Upper Canada.¹⁷³ When the Postmaster General, in the face of that, still adhered to office, it made him still more inclined to believe that that hon. gentleman was not the pure patriot he wished to be taken for, in sticking to the house till the crumbling bricks fell about him. Again, when he saw certain hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada bringing their influence to bear in such a way on the Commissioner of Crown Lands that his resignation was threatened, and when the difficulty was patched up by millions of acres of land being given to the North Shore Railroad, he had another strong reason for believing that everything was not going on as it should do; and when the administration brought down in the estimates a vote of £50,000 for erecting permanent buildings at Quebec, he could support them no longer.¹⁷⁴ He would ask if the hon. members from Upper Canada would not be obliged to vote for that item now, seeing they had placed it in the estimates. When he saw that item, and heard the Attorney General East declare that it was the intention of the Government, beyond question, that a permanent seat of Government should be established at Quebec,¹⁷⁵ and when he saw the interests of the people of Upper Canada sacrificed in the matter of the North Shore Railroad, he felt that he would no longer be representing one constituent in his riding, if he had had the hardihood to support the administration any longer. The Postmaster General asked the Reformers on that side, if in voting for this motion they were prepared to adopt the member for Lambton as their leader.¹⁷⁶ But that is not his intention, he cannot and will not follow the member for Lambton as a leader, but he can sit on the opposition benches, and pursue a course which while it will not enable persons to class him as “a destructive” will at least enable him to check vices in the Government.¹⁷⁷ There were certain members of the opposition, whose views he could never endorse; but whatever differences there might be among the opposition, he would ask hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, whether their own views were not quite as far asunder. (Hear, hear.) He should vote for this motion with a great deal of pleasure, in the first place, because it declared the government had lost the confidence of the people, and in the next place because it opposed the appropriation for a permanent seat of government; and in giving that vote he was sure he would be supported by his constituents, if they could now support him in anything, which he thought was very questionable, in consequence of his having gone so long with the present Administration. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The Postmaster General asked, whether the house had not several times voted confidence in the Administration? He denied that they had done so. The nature of the votes referred to was explained by a remark of one of their warmest supporters, who said to him — “I cannot vote confidence in the Government, but I can resist a vote of want of confidence.” (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He looked upon the coalition as a necessity at the time of its formation. A coalition was necessary to carry the Clergy Reserves, Seigneurial Tenure, and Legislative Council measures, and now that the Postmaster General boasted that those measures had been perfected, there was no longer any necessity for a coalition, unless those hon. gentlemen were to remain for ever on the Treasury Benches, as living monuments of the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, that old horse which politicians had used for so many years to ride themselves into power. The old horse was now dead, but the Postmaster General would still like to bestride its ghost, to keep himself in power. — (Laughter.)¹⁷⁸ He [Mr. Smith] thought it was time for a strong party government to be formed¹⁷⁹; and he thought the only grievance the country had now to complain of, was the existence of the present Government.¹⁸⁰ The Administration

said there was no material in the house to form another Government. If that were true, his Excellency's advisers¹⁸¹ — and he says this disinterestedly, as he does not expect his constituents will ever send him back here again, should advise him [His Excellency] that they have ceased to perform their functions, and that he should¹⁸² dissolve Parliament and have another election, for if there was not in the house, there certainly was in the country, sufficient material for forming a much better Administration than the present. — (Hear, hear.) He was surprised that the Postmaster General should continue in office, when he could not command the support of any party in the house.¹⁸³ If he [Mr. Smith] was a warm supporter of the administration, and had been driven into opposition, the fact told strongly against the Postmaster General, for it told him what the feeling of Upper Canada was. If there was even a majority from Upper Canada against the Government, he did not see how the Postmaster General representing an Upper Canada constituency, could continue to keep his seat.¹⁸⁴ Last night on the question of Representation, and taking the census, the Postmaster General had the vote of one follower, and the member for Niagara another. (Hear, hear.) — The Postmaster General might say what he liked about increasing majorities, but he would say that with one exception, and that was himself (Mr. Smith), there was not a member of the Reform party who had not oftener than once voted against the Government on questions of vital principle this session. (Hear, hear.) Every division that was taken, showed that the Postmaster-General had not the command of his party. (Hear, hear.)¹⁸⁵ The caucuses that had taken place were proofs of a failure of confidence.¹⁸⁶ The Postmaster General stated — and he (Mr. Smith) was happy to hear it — that if hon. gentlemen who formerly supported him now thought proper to withdraw their confidence, he knew his duty to himself. It was creditable to the hon. gentleman to take this manly stand.¹⁸⁷ The Inspector General had endeavoured to fix upon the Hon. Mr. Young the origination of the certificate system of the Board of Works, in 1852. But the statement of the member for Lennox and Addington showed that it was in existence from 1841, and Mr. Cayley held office while it was in existence up to 1848. (Hear, hear.) Every member of the Administration made a practice of blowing his own whistle, and the Postmaster-General accordingly extolled his own administration of the Post-Office. Did it speak much for the management of the Postmaster General, that the accounts of the Department up to March 1855, more than a year ago, were not yet in the hands of the house? His predecessor, Mr. Malcolm Cameron, who was not one of the most attentive of Departmental officers, had his report ready in November. The Postmaster General had not attempted to meet the charge of having drawn £33,000, without the orders of the Receiver General. He had attempted, however, to justify the large deficit of £26,000 for the year, by saying that the postage was too small — that numerous new offices had been established — and that part of the deficiency was owing to the large quantity of mailing matter taken from this house. But in the year when the postage was reduced from an average rate of 9½d to 3d, and 243 new offices were established, with an augmentation of yearly travel of 440,000 miles, the deficit was only £12,000, instead of £26,000. (Hear, hear.) In 1853, there were 176 new offices established, and an augmentation of yearly travel of 499,101 miles — yet the deficit was reduced to £5,168. In the year ending April 1854, there were 153 new offices, and an increase of mileage of 588,342, and the deficit was £9,481. Next year, Mr. Spence being in office, and apparently doing nothing but dispensing patronage, there were 250 new offices established, the augmentation of yearly travel not being stated, and the deficit rose from £9,000 to £26,000. (Hear, hear.) He did not think, therefore, that the Postmaster General was entitled to quite so much credit for his management, as he took to himself. (Hear, hear.)¹⁸⁸ He (Mr. Smith) was now prepared to take an independent stand in the opposition ranks, and rather than vote for a permanent Seat of Government at Quebec he would ten thousand times over rather see the Union broken up, and he hoped it would be before such a monstrous injustice would be done to Upper Canada.¹⁸⁹ It would be impossible for any one who should vote in support of the Government on this motion, and afterwards refuse when the House should form in Committee of Supply to vote for the appropriation of £50,000 proposed by them towards the erection of permanent public buildings at Quebec. The vote of to-night was not aimed at the lives of the members of the Administration, but against their policy and measures, and he called upon every

hon. member who desired to act in accordance with the wishes of their cons[tituents, to sustain the declaration of a want of confidence. (Hear, hear, and much applause.)¹⁹⁰

MR. HOLTON rose to make an explanation in behalf of his hon. friend and colleague, Mr. Young, who was attacked in his absence last night by the Inspector General, in a most ungenerous and unwarrantable manner. It would be remembered that the Inspector General ventured to affirm that the system of cashing Board of Works certificates by the banks, which was commented upon and condemned by his hon. friend in the report of the Committee on Public Accounts, originated with Mr. Young himself, when in office in 1852.¹⁹¹ He (Mr. Holton) was not in a position at the moment to contradict the statement, although he had great doubts of its accuracy.¹⁹² [He] had this morning telegraphed the said statement to the hon. Mr. Young, now absent in Montreal,¹⁹³ and received the following telegraphic reply: "I have telegraphed Mr. Cayley that his statement is untrue in every respect, and that I expect him to correct it. (Hear, hear.) The system was in existence long before my time, and was one of the things I intended to reform." Mr. Young was in office only ten months. "Mr. Cayley's statement is without a shadow of truth, a fact Mr. Begley can easily prove."¹⁹⁴ He (Mr. Holton) had received his message about five o'clock¹⁹⁵. Mr. Cayley had got a similar telegraph some hours ago, but he had waited in vain to see him rise in his place, and do Mr. Young the justice of contradicting the calumnies to which he had given circulation. (Hear, hear.)¹⁹⁶ With respect to the allusions which the hon. Inspector General had made to himself, he should embrace another opportunity to reply thereto. At present he wished simply to exonerate his respected colleague (Mr. Young) from an unjust and calumnious imputation.¹⁹⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said he had received a telegraph from Mr. Young, but he had not considered it his duty to read it to the house, till he had an opportunity of seeing Mr. Begley.¹⁹⁸ But [he] did not think it made the hon. gentleman's position much better, for it was quite evident that in his capacity as chairman of [the] committee on public accounts, he had charged the Administration with malpractices, which he now states were in operation when he himself was in office.¹⁹⁹ It was not true, as had been asserted by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Sidney Smith) that the system of cashing board of works' certificates at the bank, was in existence, when he (Mr. C.) was formerly in office, for at that time²⁰⁰ they had no fiscal agent, and no bank to call upon them to pay these certificates.²⁰¹

MR. BROWN. — There was no money in the Bank then.²⁰²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — That was the case; we had no money in the bank, although there might have been, and no doubt more certificates. But the charge was that our balances were not the real balances but were fallacious and misrepresented the actual state of the public chest. What he complained of was, that the practice was in existence when he entered office, and had grown up with Mr. Young or about his time.²⁰³ He (Mr. Cayley) felt convinced that the report upon which the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton), had so dilated, was kept back, in order to be presented during the absence of the Chairman of [the] Committee on public accounts, with an express view to damage the administration, and perhaps in aid of the present attack upon their position in relation to this House, (hear, hear.)²⁰⁴

MR. HOLTON replied, he had sought to bring forward this report at an earlier date, but owing to the impossibil[i]ty of forming a quorum, he was obliged to move for a reduction of the requisite number, and it was only then he had succeeded in completing the business of the Committee. There was no particular object involved in the presentation of the report.²⁰⁵ The charge of the Inspector General on the previous night was that his hon. colleague, Mr. Young, in the report of the committee of public accounts of which he was chairman — report[ed] against a practice, which had originated with Mr. Young himself. He would now ask the Inspector General to say categorically whether he did so or not? He attempts to raise a new issue by referring to matters connected with 1847 and 1848.²⁰⁶

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY made no reply.²⁰⁷

DR. CLARKE thought this debate had taken altogether too personal a turn; and as he had himself been personally and directly alluded to especially by the hon. member for Northumberland, (S. Smith), he felt himself called upon to say a few words in reply.²⁰⁸ [He] considered that the count[r]y cared nothing about the matter, whether Mr. Young was wrong or not. These remarks and explanations were no doubt got up for party purposes and for no other object. To him it was a matter of no consequence whether the hon. member for Montreal or the hon. member for Huron held the office of Inspector General. He asked no favors from the Government; and would support them when he considered them right.²⁰⁹ [He] had been surprised to find those hon. members who had urged on the Government the adoption of a permanent Seat of Government, now opposing the action taken by the Executive in pursuance of a vote of a majority of this House²¹⁰.

Hear, hear on the Ministerial side.²¹¹

[DR. CLARKE continued:] The hon. member for Northumberland had taunted him with being burned in effigy amongst some of his town constituents²¹² for having voted to remove the seat of Government permanently to Quebec, ... [but] he did not care for that²¹³. He had no doubt that had he followed the example of certain hon. members who it was not n[ecess]ary to name, he might have not only escaped such indignation, but received the homage of his constituents, (hear, hear, and laughter.) It was neither generous nor reasonable for any hon. member to impugn his (Dr. C.'s) motives, and to deny him the privilege accorded to every man, even in political life, the liberty to think for himself, to act after the dictates of his own conscience. (Hear, hear).²¹⁴ If he came to this House and asked £10,000 or £20,000 appropriations for his county, and if he sent any telegraph to them he would not be burned in effigy. But he asked no personal favor from [the] Government, and therefore it was nothing to him who sat upon the Treasury Benches; at the same time he could not see why the Government could be censured for doing what the House had instructed them to do. In making this appropriation they were only acting in obedience to the vote of this House. He was prepared to support the appropriation for public buildings at Quebec,²¹⁵ and if the Government were defeated on that question, he thought they ought to resign.²¹⁶ He might be burned in effigy again for that vote; but he felt that the returning good sense of the country would agree with him. He had supported the Government during the whole session and he would require more reasons than had yet been given to make him change his opinions.²¹⁷ He could not discover the utility of repeatedly raking up the declarations of conventions and platforms, musty and useless reminiscences. So long as, in his own opinion, the Government continued to merit support, he should continue to extend to them his votes.²¹⁸

MR. POWELL then rose and said — this debate has taken a very wide range; and although it is desirable that every hon. gentleman in this house should express his opinions upon the motion before the chair, I shall be very brief in my observations. The original amendment, as proposed by the hon. member for L'Assomption, involved the mere question as to whether this house was prepared to sustain the government in the recommendation for the appropriation, which they brought down to this house, for the construction of the government buildings at Quebec. Had the question been narrowed down to this, I should not have hesitated for a moment as to the course I should have pursued. From the first time that the question of the seat of government was discussed in this house, and from the time I had a seat in this house, I distinctly declared that I was prepared, as I am now, to affirm the principle of permanency in opposition to the system of alternation, and to support the selection of any city for the seat of government, no matter where it might be, putting aside all local considerations. That having been the case, and the question having narrowed itself down to the mere motion proposed by the hon. member for L'Assomption, I should have no hesitation in the course I should feel myself bound to pursue. I should have felt myself bound to sustain the government in the policy which they enunciated upon this occasion.

They did not come down here and ask us to select Quebec as the city for the future seat of government, but they put in the estimates, which they brought before the house, an appropriation in obedience to the behests of this house, and I must say that I was astonished when I found that the hon. members for Sherbrooke and L'Assomption were the first to arraign them upon the very course which the government pursued in obedience to their behests. (Hear, hear.) It might answer their party views to take such a position, but, as far as I am concerned, I have taken a position upon this question quite irrespective of party or mere sectional feelings. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton) said, last night, that he was a firm believer that Montreal was the place most eligible to be the permanent seat of government, and he declared that, next to Montreal, he would select Quebec.²¹⁹

MR. HOLTON. — I did not state that.²²⁰

MR. POWELL. — I so understood you; and it was particularly impressed upon my mind, because it was a contradiction of the views which I thought were entertained by the Montreal section of the house. (Laughter.)²²¹

MR. HOLTON. — What I said was this, that I thought that Montreal was the most advantageous place for a permanent seat of government, but that, as a friend of the union, I considered the choice was restricted to Montreal, Ottawa and Kingston, and that any attempt to fix the permanent seat of government at either extremity of the Province would endanger the union.²²²

MR. POWELL. — Well, we hear hon. members rise and state that, if the seat of government is carried to Quebec it would involve a dissolution of the union. Now I say, most unhesitatingly, that if the union is bound by so miserable a tie, then the sooner that it is dissolved the better. (Hear, hear.) If the bright interests of this country are to be sacrificed for the mere question of locality where the government is to be carried on, let that result follow. (Hear, hear.) If the people of this country do not regard with deeper interest the true welfare of the country, involving as it does the union, then I say that union must be a hollow one. With respect to the course pursued by the government upon this question, I believe that they are willing to adopt any course that may be suggested by the majority of the house. They have not the principle of cohesion within themselves, and they could not muster courage enough to agree among themselves where the seat of government should be, in a question like this, involving the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown. They had not the courage, cohesion, necessary strength, among themselves, to advise the Governor General, as the representative of the Sovereign, what course he should pursue upon this question. (Hear, hear.) Involved in the amendment of the hon. member for L'Assomption is the motion of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton).²²³ The question had taken a wider range, and embraced the whole conduct of the administration.²²⁴ Now if any honest man, in or out of the house, can get up and say that the policy of this administration has not disappointed the just expectations of the country (hear, hear); if he can say that there is not one universal dissatisfaction prevalent throughout the length and breadth of the land from Sandwich to Gaspé — (hear, hear,) — then I know not what the sentiments of the people of this country are. I care not whether they are reflected by the press or not. But *The Old Countryman*²²⁵, the Government organ in this city,²²⁶ manfully declared in its columns the week before last (laughter) that it admired the position (laughter) of the present Administration; that they had the pluck and spirit to retain their seats, although nine-tenths of the press of the Province were opposed to them. (Hear, hear.) I know not really what the effect of this motion will be. The hon. member for Northumberland has said that in all probability if a majority of this house from Upper Canada recorded their votes against the Administration upon this occasion, that the Administration will feel it necessary to resign, or at all events that the man of letters, the Post Master General, (laughter) will assume the virtue of resignation. (Hear, hear.) I do not know whether he will do that.²²⁷ He [Mr. Powell] did not think any portion of Government should resign because they found themselves in a minority in Upper Canada. We were a united Province, and while we remained united, the Government should retain their

place so long as they could command a majority in the whole House.²²⁸ If we appeal to the experience of the past we will find that the Hon. Mr. Draper governed this country with a Lower Canadian majority invariably opposed to them upon all questions, but still he did not find it necessary in consequence of that to resign. I believe in the principle which has been initiated by the hon. member for Lambton, that the dividing line which distinguishes these two Provinces should be destroyed as to Representation by Population and I announce my intention to-night to support him in that. (Hear, hear.) These distinctions between the two sections should not be drawn from time to time. It is one of the great reasons why I oppose the Administration that they have not the ability to draw from both sections of the Province those materials which are requisite and beneficial for each as far as the Legislature of this Province is concerned, and that they are not prepared to destroy the distinctions which exist between the two sections of the Province. We have found them adopting a policy with regard to the Schools which was repudiated by Upper Canada, and they ask this house to controul the distribution of the public monies, for the Lower Canadian people. (Hear, hear.) I had hoped that we would have had a Government in the present Coalition which would have been prepared to have taken a different course. Hon. gentlemen have gone into the history of the Coalition. I wish to state my knowledge of its organization. I entered this house as a young and inexperienced member. (Hear, hear.) At a time when the unnatural events occurred which brought about the existing Coalition, I as one of the Conservatives of Upper Canada protested against that. I desired that that party should stand before the country with clean hands, characters unblemished, and honor undisputed.²²⁹ He [Mr. Powell] believed the Conservatives should have avoided a coalition requiring a relinquishment of the principles of the party. After the great questions which divided parties had been decided, then and not till then should any fusion of parties take place.²³⁰ That was the policy which I advocated in the caucus where this question was discussed by the members of my party. A different result, however, has followed; but I certainly was not prepared to isolate myself from my friends, and those to whom I had always looked for advice and with whom I had held communion in political matters. I had the hon. members for Glengarry and Lambton before my eyes, and was not prepared to see them take the reins of Government. (Hear, hear.) But I gave in my adhesion to this Government, and I have regretted it from the beginning down to the present moment. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Smith) had spoken about the necessity for sackcloth and ashes, and I must say that I never felt so penitent as he has, for I do not think that I have sacrificed my conscience and honest convictions as often as he has. He has been, for the Government, (hesitating,) I will not say a *claqueur*.²³¹

MR. S. SMITH. — Yes; go on.²³²

MR. POWELL. — Well, never mind; the honourable member said that the honourable member for Wellington (Dr. Clarke) was burned in effigy once, and that he had announced himself ready to be burnt over again. (Laughter.) But if we take the member for Northumberland's statement, we can imagine that he is pretty well politically singed. (Laughter, hear, hear.) Although the present Government were left heirs to the Clergy Reserves and Legislative Council measures, unfortunately they were also left heirs to a something which they have not got rid of, and that was "the corruption which characterized the late Government." (Hear, hear.) I do not mean to charge upon the members of the Administration that their inclinations are naturally more corrupt than those of any other men, but I do feel that there must be something radically wrong in the system (hear, hear,) by which this country is governed,²³³ [that] under it, corruption to a greater or lesser extent must exist²³⁴, and I desire its discontinuance. By our principle of Responsible Government the Executive placed in this house ... are obliged to pander to the will of the representatives sent by the people, and to maintain their position by buying up those representatives, and on the one hand those representatives are influenced by the amount of patronage and the influence of various kinds which the Executive exercises. The system is unwholesome and radically wrong. (Hear, hear.) I trust it will be discontinued, but if it is I want to see the Government in the hands of a party, not of a Coalition. (Hear, hear.) It was got up upon a forfeiture of all principle.²³⁵ [Mr. Powell then]

alluded to the attacks upon the member for Toronto [Mr. Cameron] by a certain journal, then the organ of the Government; and although he did not find fault with that journal, he did censure the Government for having allowed their organ to attack a gentleman who had so often come to their assistance when they were unable to defend themselves²³⁶, and [who] because of that treatment ... had been estranged from the Administration.²³⁷ They sought the opportunity when the Premier was on a bed of sickness to come against him and try to overthrow him and destroy his position, but that pluck which has characterized that gentleman from his childhood upwards, has risen superior to all their connivances. The result is, that the hon. Premier is where he is. — (Laughter.) It may be all very well for members of the Administration to deny that there has been any conspiring against the hon. and gallant Knight, although we hear the hon. member for Northumberland declare that there was a caucus held of the moderate Reformers and Conservatives with the knowledge of the Postmaster General, with regard to the re-adjustment of the Government. Did that re-adjustment involve the removal of Sir Allan McNab? Nobody can suppose that it meant anything else.²³⁸ The attempts, however, had been unsuccessful, and the result was that utter disunion prevailed in the Administration²³⁹. In my opinion this existing coalition is now become as discordant as the materials of the Opposition to which reference has been made.²⁴⁰ There had been a time when a statement by a minister bore its own certificate [sic] of truth, but ... that time had ceased. They had seen one minister state one thing, and his colleagues another, on great constitutional questions.²⁴¹ In the Duval case for instance, the Attorney General East laid down one principle of constitutional law, and the Attorney General West insisted that no principle of constitutional law was involved.²⁴² [OR] The Attorney General West has been seen to come down and declare that to be a principle of law where the Attorney General East declares that there is no principle of law involved. And yet in spite of all these discordances of opinion, by means of that influence which they bring to bear on members of the House, they are able to obtain a willing majority.²⁴³ But it is no longer consistent with the interests of the Province that such an Administration should govern the Province. (Hear, hear.) If to the world is to be proclaimed their weakness, (at all events as far as the confidence of this house is concerned) I say that the sooner that they abandon their seats the better, and I would not be so glad to see them out of their seats as I would wish to see this House rid of all its members. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) I do not blame the Government so much as the whole house, but unfortunately influences are brought to bear upon the Administration, which enables [sic] them to retain their seats. Does any body tell me that the present house reflects the opinion of the country? If he does, I beg to differ with him emphatically. True the Postmaster General has said that he and his friends have a right to have a monument erected to their memories. (Great laughter.) But upon what grounds pray? (Hear, hear.) Their Religious Incorporation Bill was a most objectionable and obnoxious one, (hear, hear,) and which has been condemned by Upper Canada from one end to the other, until the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron) came to their relief. And upon this Bill the hon. gentlemen of the administration plumed themselves. I believe that there is not a principle of any kind which this house says it is in favour of, which the administration will not support. (Hear, hear.) They are willing to adopt the views of the house I say, and to hold their tenure of office under any circumstances, and to cling to the Treasury Benches. I believe that the hon. member for Lambton could not propose any particular scheme which, commanding a majority of this house, the administration would not be prepared to adopt. (Hear, hear.) But I think the duty of a Government should be of a more exalted nature — (hear, hear) — and that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches ought to be able to initiate measures, and to direct public opinion in the proper course; that the present Government are not capable of doing that, I believe the verdict of the country will universally echo. (Applause.) I have watched it from its incipency to what, I trust, to-night, will be its termination. (Hear, hear.) I have sat by its cradle, have heard its infantile whines, and it was the whine of inconsistency, of corruption, and dishonesty. (Laughter.) I have hoped against hope that as the infant became gradually developed, and connected itself with purer influences, such as it might have drawn from this side of the house if they had taken our advice, they would have grown into something healthy and creditable to themselves. (Hear, hear.) But day after day I have found them growing worse and worse, and I trust

that the voices which have echoed through this house will be those which will sound their funeral requiem, and I myself will be happy to be one of the mourners.²⁴⁴

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON then addressed the house as follows: — As some accusations have been brought against several departments of the Government, and against that over which I have the honour to preside, I would like that the hon. member for Montreal had been more specific. The very moment that we came into office we met in the way men who were not actuated by a desire to serve the country, but to throw obstacles in the way of those who were placed by the people at the head of the Government, to embarrass them. A committee was formed, presided over by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Galt), to enquire into my department. There was evidence given before that committee by certain officers of the Crown Lands Department, and when some contrary evidence was given by [other] officers, that evidence was kept aside, and not published with the rest.²⁴⁵

MR. GALT. — Of what evidence do you speak?²⁴⁶

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — Of the evidence given by Mr. Dawson. There was an under current working, and evidence is in existence to show it, and when evidence was brought to condemn a certain mode of action in the way of carrying on the business of my department, that evidence was accepted, but the rebutting testimony was excluded.²⁴⁷

MR. GALT. — Does the hon. gentleman mean to assert that there was any evidence suppressed by this committee?²⁴⁸

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — I mean *that* positively.²⁴⁹

MR. GALT. — It is utterly groundless. It is true that the whole mass of evidence was necessarily left in the hands of the clerk, to be printed at the end of the session. The committee reported the last day of the session. There was a large mass of evidence; the whole of it was left with him, and was I believe printed. If any part of it was omitted it was not my fault. There was no disposition by the committee to suppress anything. Upon the contrary, their very report shews that they recommended that this evidence should be taken up again by a new committee this session. Therefore the hon. Commissioner for Crown Lands is entirely in error if he thinks there was any intention upon the part of the committee to do injustice to anybody.²⁵⁰

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — I will read the fact from the gentleman who brought his evidence before the committee. I complained at the outset that we had no time to defend ourselves, because the evidence was brought by Mr. Galt before the committee at an improper time. While the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Young) accused the department of imbecility or of a desire not to do their duty, I say that those accusations²⁵¹ were thrown before the House and the country before an opportunity was afforded to the accused of making themselves acquainted with the evidence on which those accusations were founded, and before the accused had an opportunity of checking and counteracting them.²⁵² But I care not for such attacks. I am ready to share in the responsibility of what takes place in my department, and to show that these accusations are unfounded and groundless. It is very curious that they are brought forward by some persons in the department, and that all the opinions given on one side have been published, and the adverse opinions not.²⁵³

MR. GALT. — I say it is not so.²⁵⁴

[MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON] does not wonder that evidence was given by employees of the Government, which suited the purposes of that committee, because there are spies in every government, and because²⁵⁵ in all departments there were parties disposed to give evidence against the

management of their departments. He read a letter from Mr. Dawson, complaining that certain documentary evidence had been suppressed in the report. It was a most remarkable fact that the evidence which tended to relieve the Department from blame, had been omitted from that report.²⁵⁶ I will give you the fact. — This is Mr. Dawson's own statement. Mr. Langton states "that the only safeguard in determining whether all the accounts approved of are duly paid or not, consists in the publication of all the collections every year. This idea is entirely taken from the suggestions made in the department." It is proved that this suggestion came from the department, and these facts were laid before it, and while every evidence was given against it, that evidence which vindicated its conduct was suppressed.²⁵⁷ He [Mr. Cauchon] had always done what lay in his power to render Mr. Langton assistance in checking any irregular[i]ties in the accounts of the departments.²⁵⁸

MR. MACKENZIE. — It's not so.²⁵⁹

[MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON proceeded:] I took every opportunity not only to afford to Mr. Langton the opportunity of knowing all the facts in relation to my department, but I told the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Young) that any suggestions he had to make in relation to it, if approved of by me, would be adopted, for I wished to render it as effective as possible; and I think in that I had the approbation of the hon. member for Sherbrooke. When the discussion took place upon its internal management, the latter hon. gentleman came to the conclusion that the position which I had taken as to the department, was a proper one. — Of course, I have not been able to carry out every improvement suggested, for there has not been time during this session to carry out great changes, but I have improved it.²⁶⁰ He [Mr. Cauchon] had endeavored on every occasion to compel every person in his department to discharge his duty faithfully and carefully. He had removed persons who were found to be dishonest in their proceedings, and had removed agents against whom specific charges had been brought and proven. His reply to every person who made a complaint against an agent was, "bring a specific charge, and if you can prove it, that agent will be dismissed."²⁶¹ If anybody can accuse me of injustice in these respects, I will bear censure. But we have been accused of things which existed long prior to my holding office, and for which I cannot be held accountable; and those very accusers were the men who have passed away from their tenure of office, and were themselves guilty of what they charge us with, and who were either dishonest while in the department or imbecile. — I am not disposed to listen to such accusations, when I can controvert them by facts. A letter was placed before the committee by Mr. Langton, which was left aside from the 28th of February, to late in March, because it was forgotten, and because the contents of it were not thought to be of such importance as to require immediate action at a time when we were over-crowded by work, (and if I had known that that letter was set aside, I should have insisted upon an answer being given) but it was laid before the committee, and the question raised was, whether the facts stated were correct or not. I am convinced that Mr. Langton had done his duty to the best of his ability. I will now refer to a statement placed in my hands by Mr. Ford, but I do not take the responsibility of it. Mr. Ford thinks he has been unjustly treated, and says, "Mr. Langton states there is £10,000 difference in the accounts. Mr. Langton never examined nor audited the books and accounts of the Crown Lands Department; he never saw, nor did he ever ask to see the Blotter, Cash Book or Ledger. How then could he with so much confidence appear before the Committee on Public Accounts, and report that there was £10,166 15s. 9d. unaccounted for? It is true, that amount appears as the debit of the Receiver General; but a corresponding credit appears in the Deposit Accounts, and the accounts of the agent, as shown by the balance sheet. He certainly cannot be said to have done his duty as Auditor, so far as the Crown Lands Department is concerned, for he has not even taken the trouble to ascertain if the balance sheet furnished to him corresponds with the Ledger Balances. A few vouchers were not furnished, being retained in the office, as Mr. Langton well knows, for the simple reason that they were not in duplicate; and I was unwilling they should leave the office. Mr. Langton was aware of this, and said he was perfectly satisfied, and that he would send a clerk to examine them at the department. All I have got to say is, that he has not

done so, and this neglect on his part, is now converted into an accusation against the Crown Lands Department, of incompetency and confusion. I have no accusation to bring against Mr. Langton. I believe he has done his duty. It is true that he never audited the books; and how did he know that it was not a falsified sheet which he looked at. This £10,000 is composed of deposits, and how could it be entered on account of the government. It was impossible to enter it to the government, because we do not know whether they belong to the government or not, and we have only to show that they are entered, so that it may be made known that the money is entered. This money stands therefore perfectly explained, being deposits. We have all the vouchers; and with the desire expressed that the auditor of public accounts may come and see them, I do not understand how I can be blamed. Mr. Langton also asserts that there is another charge of £9,000 as to the Woods and Forests expenditure, and for which there are no vouchers. Now see how the fact stands. "It has not been the custom to send these vouchers to the Inspector General's Department, simply because they were not required; but they are in the Crown Lands' Department, a knowledge of which has not been withheld from Mr. Langton, and they were open for his inspection." I have taken the opportunity of looking at these vouchers to-night²⁶² before coming down to the House, and if Mr. Langton or any member of the House wished to see them they would be produced at once.²⁶³ Then, why should we be accused with having spent £9,000, for which we have no vouchers?²⁶⁴ Then there is a charge that £5,000 as duties on timber are not accounted for by the department. But the fact again is, that in pursuance of a long [sic] continued practice, those duties are not collected until the timber is sold. That he will admit is a practice that may be open to objection: but it is a practice which the department has simply followed out.²⁶⁵ That £5,000 was not paid. It is due upon the timber, and it was specifically mentioned in the Account, that it was not collected. I am ready to admit that that sum ought not to be placed at the credit of the Crown Lands' Department, as long as it is not paid. It can be placed at the credit of the Government or to the debit of Mr. Stuart, the agent in Quebec. I have nothing else to say upon this.²⁶⁶ There are some other facts which might be mentioned, for the purpose of disproving the allegations contained in the report of the committee, but he had not had time to examine it with sufficient care to point them out to the House on the moment.²⁶⁷ But as soon as it is published we can discuss it.²⁶⁸ The system was far from perfect, but he was as anxious as any one to remedy the defects.²⁶⁹ It is all very well for the hon. member for Lambton and other hon. gentlemen to complain of my Department. They only do it to excite the feelings of the people for their own purposes, and they had not a single feeling of patriotism in them. It was easy to condemn the work but have those who blame my department [sic] ever done anything for the benefit of the country? No. I have been twelve years in Parliament, and have been told over and over again by the hon. member for Lambton that my constituents would not return me, if I did not vote with him, but nevertheless I have been returned²⁷⁰ five times. The member for Lambton is in the habit of telling members who oppose him, that they will not be returned again, but those prophecies have seldom been borne out by the fact.²⁷¹ So long as I fulfil my obligations of office, I have no doubt I shall receive the confidence of the people.²⁷² If the Government had ceased to enjoy the confidence of the House, however, he [Mr. Cauchon] could gladly for one bow to that decision. The opposition had never originated a measure worth contending for. They were destructive, in fact, and although able to tear down could not be able to build up. This cry, that the Government did not represent the country was an old one, and it was just as valueless as it was old. The country must be represented through the House, and if the Government had a majority there, they must assume that they represent the people. The members of the House were the chosen of the people, and their vote must be assumed as a verdict.²⁷³ But I must allude to the unhealthy state of public opinion. Upper Canada is never satisfied even if it obtains all it requires. But we must hope for a change on their part. I have often voted against the feelings of those whom I represented, and I have gone to my constituents afterwards and have vindicated my conduct. I had a great desire upon the Seigniorial Bill to do equal justice between Seigneur and Censitaire, and have always wished to act justly in all measures. But I am ready to submit to the will of the people, when it is a question simply of opinion, and when after discussion the majority of the people are on one side, but not otherwise.²⁷⁴

MR. GALT. — With regard to the charges which I understand the Commissioner for Crown Lands to make against the Committee on Public Accounts, that we had suppressed evidence, I would merely say, that the returns referred to were very bulky, containing the particulars of the licences of timber limits. Attached to each of them was a recapitulation. The committee found that it would have cost several hundred pounds to have printed this mass, and they did not see that any practical good connected with their enquiries would be arrived at. There was no suppression of the facts at all, neither did the committee show any hostile feeling to the Commissioner of Crown Lands.²⁷⁵ And considering there were several members of the Committee favourable to the government, including the honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands, it was not at all likely that any material information could have been withheld.²⁷⁶

MR. JACKSON (speaking from the Opposition benches)²⁷⁷ said, — I mean to confine my speech principally to some remarks made by the Postmaster General, and I refer to him particularly because I have supported the Government of which he is a member, and principally on that account. I have felt considerable interest in that gentleman, and he will excuse me if I intend doing so now somewhat, because he was associated with me and many others in the profession of Reform principles, and I am sure that all other hon. gentlemen in this House, professing those principles, must likewise feel the same interest in him. (Hear, hear.)²⁷⁸ The Post Master General referred to matters connected with the formation of the present Government, and stated that at that period difficulties existed, and that these difficulties arose in consequence of dissensions in the reform party. He [Mr. Jackson] was ready to admit that, and that it was more than probable that the existence of a coalition ministry arose out of dissensions in the reform party. It was a matter of history, however, that that Government was formed. When that Government was formed, he trembled for the position which the Post Master General occupied. He was surprised when he heard of it, and considered that the hon. gentleman manifested a degree of confidence which very few of the members of the reform party would have manifested. The Post Master General then took a step which very few reformers would have taken. But he would admit that in the first session he [the Postmaster General] carried out fully, fairly, honestly and manfully the engagements under which he had come when he entered that Government. He said it was formed for the purpose of carrying out the Clergy Reserves, the Seigniorial Tenure Bill, and the Legislative Council Bill.²⁷⁹ It is true that this Government was formed to carry out the measures set forth by them at the commencement. But difficulties arose, so that the Reformers could not dispose of those measures, and it appeared necessary from the circumstances that existed, that there should be an union of parties in order to remove the difficulties which accumulated. The Coalition was formed, and I think that the best use we can make of them in view of the past is, to guide and regulate our course of conduct for the future,²⁸⁰ for the simple expression of regret at any course, does not at all change the position of affairs²⁸¹; and according to my own philosophy I think the Coalition was necessary, and I can prove it, from the fact of its existence. (Hear, hear.)²⁸² [There were] measures that were to be carried through, and the members of the Government had the work assigned to them, and they were paid for the performance of it. But the Government had taken the same course with regard to themselves that they did with regard to the contracts with Mr. Baby — they had increased their salaries considerably. It had been said that one of these measures formed sufficient capital to immortalize the men who were engaged in carrying it out; but it appeared to him that if such was the case, some men might do a large business upon very small capital. It appeared to him that the coalition were simply²⁸³ trading upon capital which the previous Government had made. Their measures have been introduced, and scarcely that. The present Government took up the Clergy Reserves Bill. It appears upon the very face of it that the present Government had nothing to initiate upon this subject.²⁸⁴ It was the same measure which was formerly brought it [sic] — reproduced it is true — but it appeared before the election, and the present Government merely took it up²⁸⁵; and there was an union of parties, therefore, and a bargain made that that Bill should be carried out. It is not necessary for me to allude to my own conduct. My votes upon these measures sufficiently indicate the feeling I had of these measures. The Coalition Government exists in consequence of the division of the Reform party. I am ready to

admit that this Coalition may be one of the penalties which the Reform party is called upon to pay²⁸⁶ for having neglected to do something which they ought to have done, or for their having done something wrong — something which they ought not to have done, for ... if men offended against any law they would not offend with impunity.²⁸⁷ When political parties forget their principles, they will be punished in some way or other. (Hear, hear.) I will refer to something said about the Premier at the beginning of the Session. He stated that it had been his object ever since it had been his honor to hold his high position, to take care that the Reformers should have their fair share of patronage, and that so long as he continued in the Government, he would see to that, and that especially the Reformers would have no occasion to grumble. Now I mention this in order to shew, that a Government which is so constituted as the present, that has to apportion its patronage in proportion to the constituent elements which form that Government, cannot be united in its policy. (Hear, hear.)²⁸⁸ A Government composed of Reformers and Conservatives, and having large patronage at its disposal, must necessarily have much of its time and attention occupied in deliberating upon the manner in which this patron[a]ge must be dispensed.²⁸⁹ What can a Coalition Government be but a dispenser of the patronage in its hands? and the whole history of the present Coalition²⁹⁰ goes to show that they have occupied their time with very little else than with the disposal of the patronage placed under their control.²⁹¹

MR. LARWILL asked if he was obliged to sit here as he had been for two consecutive days, listening to all sorts of things that have been published in newspapers long ago. He wanted to go home and go to bed.²⁹²

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the hon. gentlemen knew the usage of Parliament as well as the Speaker.²⁹³

MR. JACKSON said he would not occupy their time much longer. (Go on.) Difficulties have existed [sic]. He would not say in the Government²⁹⁴, [but] there has been difficulty existing among the supporters of the Government, and we know that those dissensions have been removed by a concoction of schemes having for their object a union of persons from different sections of the country; and this is another instance in which the patronage was given away in order to sustain itself, and unite men of different political opinions. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to the meeting of Reformers held not long since, at which the hon. member for Victoria was present, and I do not think that since that hon. member has given a vote in favor of the Government, or in this House at all. The Postmaster General says, that if his friends the Reformers were to withdraw their confidence in an unmistakable manner, that he knew what his duty would be under the circumstances, and that he was prepared to resign. Now I think the Postmaster General has been already made fully acquainted with the opinions of the members of this House who are supposed to have the confidence of the Postmaster General, and to sympathise with him. I would ask that hon. gentleman whether the understanding of the Coalition was not, that he was to be considered as Representative of the Reformers of Upper Canada in this House? If that were so, then I think there is evidence sufficient to prove that heretofore the hon. gentleman has had an unequivocal expression of the Reformers of Upper Canada in reference to the Governmental policy, and his position here. An intimation was given to him that the Reformers had no confidence in the present Government, (and I feel he will not deny that) by Messrs. Conger and Niles. (Hear, hear.) I will not recapitulate what I have said on former occasions in this House, or refer to the subsequent interviews which were had with the hon. member for Peterborough after that intimation had been conveyed to the Postmaster General. The hon. gentleman has denied that this intimation was given to him that he should retire from the ministry. (Hear, hear.) Now I do not know how any other conclusion could be drawn from the statement made by the hon. member for Peterborough to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman might have asked the hon. member from Peterborough, "What do you mean when you say that you have no confidence in the Government. Is it to be understood that I am to withdraw from it?"

(Laughter.) I can understand that all this took place, but yet the Postmaster-General thinks that this did not convey an accurate intimation of the desire of these gentlemen. With reference to that hon. gentleman's Department,²⁹⁵ [I will] do the Post Master-General the justice to say that ... [in my opinion] the post-office department is carefully, efficiently, and honestly attended to²⁹⁶, for I do not know that any complaints exist as to it, I have no evidence of any. I believe that if he²⁹⁷ (the Postmaster General) had carried out his honest convictions, and been true to his principles, and true to his party, there was no hon. gentleman in this House who would have occupied a higher position in the country than the Postmaster General²⁹⁸ [OR] who would have occupied a better position before the Reformers than he does. (Hear, hear.) It was very amusing to hear the Commissioner for Crown Lands to-night stand up in his place. Anybody would have supposed that his object was to defend the government, and to endeavour to secure a vote of confidence from the House in the Government; but he comes down here, and nearly the whole of his speech was in condemnation of the course pursued by the gentlemen appointed by the Administration. I listened to it with great surprise. I suppose there was a Cabinet Council held to-day. (Laughter.) It was a most singular defence of the Government. He denounces the gentleman who was believed by this House to be capable of overlooking the books and accounts, until the Commissioner of Crown Lands has come down and made his remarkable statement. The Inspector General last night claimed credit for the appointment of Mr. Langdon [sic] as Auditor General, and the Commissioner comes down to this House to-night, and that very point upon which the government staked its whole character has been denounced by that hon. gentleman. When the hon. gentleman came on here it is well known that he brought about a system of regulations in the Department, which were thought to be very obnoxious²⁹⁹. The impression upon his (Mr. Jackson's) mind was that the hon. gentleman had turned the Crown Lands department into a Convent, of which he was Superior.³⁰⁰ When he was questioned as to his department, did he come down and shew that he had adopted a system of regulations calculated to raise him in the estimation of this House? He did no such thing. He attempted to raise for himself a character upon the destruction of those of his subordinates in that office. (Oh, oh.) He comes down and says that papers had been abstracted, that peculation had been carried on³⁰¹; the officers were lazy and did not do their duty, and men of character, men of intelligence and refined feeling were denounced in order that he might rear for himself a character upon the destruction of men whose characters had never been called in question.³⁰² He said that 2000 letters had been written by his department in a short time, as an instance of the success of his institutions. I believe that these 2000 letters contained more erroneous information than has ever been contained in any 2000 letters sent from any part of the Province whatever, (laughter,) because the system adopted to obtain that information is one which will not allow of proper information being obtained. I feel more interest in the Postmaster-General than any other hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.)³⁰³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Oh! I dare say.³⁰⁴

MR. JACKSON. — Yes, I can assure him. Does any hon. gentleman here believe that the strength of the government was increased by the introduction of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Morrison) into it. (Hear, hear.) There is not an hon. member, but who was surprised that a gentleman of the hon. member for Niagara's character should have placed himself in that position, and have lost the confidence of the party with whom he previously acted in harmony, by allying himself with a ministry who do not possess the confidence of the House. The Postmaster General stated that he and his colleagues urged the ex-Speaker (Mr. Ross) to remain in the government, regretted that he was going out of it, and that he was at the present moment a supporter of the government. Now that statement does not very well agree with the insinuations which were thrown out on a former occasion in this House, that Mr. Ross had resigned in consequence of the existing Grand Trunk difficulties. (Hear, hear.) The Dundas *Warder*, to which the hon. gentleman is supposed to contribute, came out and charged him with having set forth a false issue, and alleged that the facts of the case upon the Grand Trunk policy were wrongly stated. (Loud cries of hear, hear.)³⁰⁵

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — During my remarks as to the accession of Mr. Morrison into the government, allusions were made to the resignation of Mr. Ross. I did not then impute any motives to his resignation. I stated distinctly that I used my best efforts to induce him to remain, and I told him at the time that other motives would be imputed to him. I did not state what the motives were, and I went no farther than that, and I hope the hon. member for Grey will not impute to me any writings in the *Dundas Warder*. (Oh! oh! hear, hear.) I do not write one line or dictate one line for it. I have other and heavier duties to discharge here, and abundance of work for the employment of my time, and I do not think it is exactly the thing to impute to me the Editorial referred to.³⁰⁶

MR. JACKSON. — Then why did you do the same thing to the hon. member for Lambton? (Hear, hear.)³⁰⁷

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Mr. Brown is not a member of the government.³⁰⁸

MR. JACKSON. — I have no disposition to bring a charge against the hon. gentleman, which is not correct, but he referred to Mr. Baldwin having yielded. Surely he must mean the time when that gentleman resigned on account of an Upper Canadian majority being against him.³⁰⁹ But certainly whatever virtue the Postmaster General and his colleagues have, they do not possess the virtue of resignation³¹⁰ [OR] the virtue of veracity. Mr. Baldwin showed respect for the principles he professed and set an example worthy of imitation. (Laughter.) I do not say that every ministry should resign upon the least clamor, but if there has been a want of character evidenced, that they must yield, and I think upon the vote the other night on the motion of the honourable member for Lambton, that there was a clear expression of opinion given which ought to influence the conduct and motions of the members of the Government, who profess to regard the principle of “Responsible Government;” and I am bound to say that the Postmaster General has violated the first principle of it, (hear, hear,) and that *he* can no longer be useful to his party or creditable to himself, whose principles no man can endure. (Hear, hear.)³¹¹ If there is to be political virtue in Canada men must recognize public opinion. Was there a Reformer in this house who would get up and say plainly that he has confidence in the present Government, and give his reasons for that confidence. He [Mr. Jackson] would defy any Reformer to stand up in this house and do so. It appeared somewhat plausible to say that the Ministry were justified in proposing to give £50,000 for public buildings at Quebec because they had been authorised by the House to do so, but his opinion was that the Government did not consider that vote an unequivocal expression of this House for this reason — the Government instead of coming down with a plan either to refer the question to Her Majesty or to continue the system — came down with this as an open question, and each individual member of the Government used his individual influence against the other members of the Government, against his own colleagues. Was that course calculated to impress the House. If each member of the Government went to his own particular friends and got them to vote for his motion, and if in this each voted against the other, was that calculated to impress the House with confidence in their proceedings.³¹² I would ask if it was possible by any means to get anything like an honest expression of this House upon the subject? It is upon that ground that I regard the Government as having acted wrong[ly], and as having forfeited the confidence of the House upon that question. And I look upon the vote to be given to-night upon this subject as being, “whether the Government shall go to Quebec, and whether there should be an appropriation of £50,000 for that purpose;” and those hon. members who vote to-night in opposition to the hon. member for Montreal’s motion, declare in the most unequivocal manner (I don’t care how they seek to evade it) that they approve of Quebec being the permanent seat of Government, and of the appropriation of £50,000 for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) So the country will regard it. I say [no]thing against Quebec, I wish for the Union,³¹³ but at the same time for a variety of reasons which might be urged,³¹⁴ I do think that the interests of this country at present, and the position of things evidence that it is highly inexpedient that vote should be given, and because it is inexpedient that the seat of Government should be placed at Quebec.³¹⁵

MR. MURNEY. — I move that we do now adjourn. (No, no. Confusion.) It is a serious question before the House, and it is one on which hon. members who assume certain respons[i]bilities will have the opportunity of expressing themselves at full length. Night after night we have been here, members are tired, and they do not feel disposed to go so seriously into this question at this late hour of the night. I move that we adjourn. (No, no. Adjourn, adjourn.)³¹⁶

MR. BROWN. — We are quite prepared on this side [of] the House to go to the vote now. There are several hon. members going to speak, and perhaps before taking the vote, the Government will state what they desire should be the course pursued.³¹⁷

DR. MASSON. — It would be very unfair that *we* should not have an opportunity of speaking. I have a speech to make. Adjourn in order to give us time to answer a great many hon. gentlemen who have insulted Lower Canada. (Laughter.)³¹⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — It is not for the Government to prevent any hon. member of this House expressing his opinion of want of confidence in the Administration, or any opinion that he thinks proper.³¹⁹ The Government is on its trial, and is altogether in the hands of the House.³²⁰ (Adjourn, adjourn.)³²¹

MR. BROWN. — I am sure that I speak the views of the members on this side of the House when I say that we are prepared to go to the vote now, (sensation — hear, hear,) but it is quite clear that the government have a right to the fullest opportunity of being heard, and that we might allow any time for the members of the House to be heard. (Confusion.) Hon. members of the opposition will agree to anything that the Administration wish in that respect, most cordially.³²²

MR. HOLTON. — Before the motion of adjournment, I wish to suggest that if we determine to adjourn, we should meet to-morrow (Saturday.) (No, no, no.)³²³

MR. S. SMITH said that it is well known that he is going to Europe to-morrow, and desired to record his vote before doing so.³²⁴ (Confusion.)³²⁵

MR. BOWES. — I would regret that Lower Canada members who wish to reply to the statements made about that section, should be prevented speaking. I think after the statement of the hon. member for Soulanges, we could not with any kind of justice deny them the opportunity of replying to any statements which they think were made disparagingly to Lower Canada.³²⁶

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — I have never had an opportunity of voting against my colleagues, and if anything would make me do so, it would be the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland. If he is going to Europe, let us have his vote to-night. (Laughter, and ironical cries of hear, hear.)³²⁷

MR. RANKIN. — I should wish to ask, if it is the desire of the government, that an adjournment should take place. (No, no.)³²⁸

MR. O'FARRELL. — I rise to a question of order. I should like to know whether the hon. gentleman has a right to ask the Government their opinion upon that point. (Great laughter.)³²⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — There really is so much confusion that I cannot keep order. Even while I am standing, my position is quite disregarded. (Order, order.)³³⁰ When the Speaker stands up to answer any question from the chair, the hon. gentlemen [sic] should take his seat.³³¹ I must say it is not Parliamentary for the hon. member to submit a question of order to the chair which is not one.³³²

MR. RANKIN made some further remarks — in reference to the propriety of adjourning that other members might have an opportunity to speak, at the same time he was deserving [sic] to take any course the ... ministry pointed out.³³³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I stated, that on a question of this kind, where the ministry of the day are on their trial, that it was not for the Government to say whether there should be an adjournment or not. (Hear, hear.) I am willing that every hon. member should have an opportunity of expressing his views, and recording his vote upon the matter. The Government feel, that it would not be doing justice to themselves if they hurried a vote when any hon. member wishes to express his opinion. (Hear! hear!) If any hon. member says that he is going to address this House, it is quite clear that it will keep us here very late. If hon. members propose to vote at once, the Government will submit. We are in the hands of the House, and it is for them to say whether we shall adjourn or not. It is not an ordinary case, where the Government, having the confidence of the majority, are disposed to conduct the business of the country; but now they are upon their trial. (Adjourn, adjourn.)³³⁴

MR. RANKIN. — I wish to remind the House that last night there appeared to be a disposition on the part of the Government rather to hurry this vote. (Hear, hear.)³³⁵

MR. TURCOTTE contended for the adjournment.³³⁶

MR. POWELL. — I agree with the Atty. Gen. West, and I cannot understand the position of the hon. member for Essex, (Mr. Rankin.) I enunciated the principle from my seat here, and I believe it will be echoed by every hon. gentlemen [sic] here, that the Government are willing to adopt the views of the majority of this House upon any question. (Great laughter.) They strongly resemble the man in the fable, with the ass. (Order, order, laughter.)³³⁷

A Member on the ministerial side. — You represent the ass. (Renewed laughter and confusion.)³³⁸

Another Member. — The *Nays* have it. (Laughter.)³³⁹

MR. POWELL. — The result of this vote will shew who is the ass, and who is the man, and whether the largest characteristic portion of the admintstration [sic] is not ass. (Laughter, order! order!) If not I will forfeit [sic] my present opinions of them, but I believe that events will shew that the Country and this House entertain this feeling that the ass is their predominant feature. (Order! order!)³⁴⁰

MR. ROBINSON. — I suppose we shall have the hon. member's *assent* to the adjournment. (Renewed laughter.)³⁴¹

MR. FOLEY (amidst confusion) rose and said — the object of the Administration is to shirk the vote (hear, hear!) feeling as they do that it will be adverse to them. (Hear, hear!) And they seize this proposition as a convenient opportunity of doing what they have done on previous occasions; namely, evading the responsibility of their acts. (Hear, hear.)³⁴² The question had been discussed for three nights, and every member had had an opportunity of speaking, or if they had not, they now had.³⁴³ I trust that so far as hon. gentlemen desirous of declaring their want of confidence in the Administration, are concerned, at all events, that they will not consent to the adjournment, but that we shall have the vote now.³⁴⁴ Several gentlemen intended to leave the city to-morrow, and³⁴⁵ the Government have not the courage to take upon themselves the responsibility.³⁴⁶

MR. LARWILL said it was not his custom to track in the steps of folly (Foley), but he warned the House against keeping up the debate. The speeches made were simply plagiarisms upon the letters of Mr. Napier and Mr. Brassey, and the leading articles of newspapers. The more words uttered, the less

was generally said.³⁴⁷ There had been a great deal of talk about their constituents, and about public opinion. What is public opinion? It is nothing. (Laughter.) Gentlemen might laugh, but it was a fact.³⁴⁸ The country had returned certain gentlemen upon great questions. Members of the Government had taken office upon the relinquishment of certain principles. They had gone back to their constituencies and at once these constituencies had turned round and returned them upon certainly different principles. The House should govern, not be governed by public opinion.³⁴⁹ What did he care for his constituents? When he did right, he did not care whether his coloured constituency approved of it or not.³⁵⁰ The opposition should not move such resolutions as those unless they were prepared to carry them. He opposed the adjournment.³⁵¹

MR. MACKENZIE thought the Government took the only course open to them. They were here upon their trial, and it was not for them to dictate to the House. He opposed the adjournment.³⁵²

MR. PAPIN complained ... [about] the position assumed by the Attorney General East, the night before last on the question of adjournment, and that of the Attorney General West to-night. There was abundant time to discuss the question to-night, and he would oppose the motion of adjournment.³⁵³

MR. O'FARRELL opposed the motion for adjournment.³⁵⁴

MR. CAMERON thought the motion for adjournment should prevail. This was the most important question they had before the House, and he thought they might well spend a few days in the discussion of it.³⁵⁵

CAPT. RHODES thought the members of the House from Lower Canada did not desire to discuss this question, but would much rather get through with it at once.³⁵⁶

The motion for adjournment was carried³⁵⁷.

(529)

Mr. *Murney* moved, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Cameron*, and the Question being put, That this House do now adjourn; the House divided: — And it was resolved in the Affirmative. The House adjourned accordingly until Monday next.³⁵⁸

Footnotes

1. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
2. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
3. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
4. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
8. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
9. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
11. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856, concurs with this paper, whereas *Globe*, 17 May 1856, does not attribute the interruption to any member in particular.
12. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856, also reports that Mr. J. Smith spoke.
13. *Globe*, 17 May 1856. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856, also reports that Mr. S. Smith spoke.
14. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.

15. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
16. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
18. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. This is the only source reporting the name of Mr. J. Smith.
19. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856, concurs with this newspaper; *Globe*, 17 May 1856, does not specify which Mr. Smith spoke.
20. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856. *Globe*, 17 May 1856, and *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856, also report that Mr. Spence referred to the members for Northumberland and Victoria.
25. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
26. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
27. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. *Globe*, 17 May 1856, differs from this newspaper and reports the following interruption: "A Member. — Stick to that, that's right."
28. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
29. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
30. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Montreal Gazette*, 21 May 1856.
37. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
38. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
39. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
40. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
41. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
42. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
43. *Montreal Gazette*, 21 May 1856.
44. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
45. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
46. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. For the part of Mr. Spence's speech which is footnoted as excerpts 46 to 59, the report of the *Toronto Daily Leader* (the most complete verbatim account of this speech) provided the main frame for the reconstitution. Excerpts from *Pilot*, 21 May 1856, were used whenever they complemented the *Toronto Daily Leader*. The reader will note, however, that the statements reported in the *Pilot* do not always follow the same order as in the *Toronto Daily Leader* and, therefore, the reconstitution of this part remains of an arbitrary nature. *Globe*, 17 May 1856, and *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856, only provide very short summaries of this part of Mr. Spence's speech.
47. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
48. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
49. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
50. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
51. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856. These statements are not reported in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856, and are therefore arbitrarily inserted at this point in Mr. Spence's speech.
52. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
53. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
54. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
55. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
56. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
57. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
58. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
59. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
60. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
61. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.

62. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
63. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
64. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
65. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
66. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
67. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
68. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856.
69. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856, reports that Mr. S. Smith answered: "A majority of one from Upper Canada." According to the votes recorded in the *Journals* of Monday, 21 April 1856, Mr. J.A. Macdonald's amendment was carried by a majority of 61 to 45, but with a majority of seven Upper Canadian members voting against the Government. In the following division, 62 members voted in support of the Government, 21 of whom represent Upper Canadian constituencies, while 45 members voted against the Government, 27 of them from Upper Canada. Mr. Spence's affirmation (footnote 72) that the Government "had a majority of six or seven Upper Canada members upon that occasion" is therefore erroneous.
70. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
79. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
80. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
81. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
82. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
83. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
84. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
85. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
86. *Ibid.*
87. *Ibid.*
88. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
89. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
90. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
91. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
92. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
93. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. This newspaper only reports a summary of Mr. Spence's explanations regarding these statements. It reads as follows: "It had been asserted that the hon. the Postmaster General signed a platform of principles at the time of those elections. The hon. gentleman here read three letters, distinctly denying that he had signed or cordially assented to the principler [sic] contained in that platform — that he had declared his intention to go to parliament untrammelled".
94. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
95. *Ibid.*
96. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
97. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
98. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
99. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
100. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
101. *Ibid.*
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856. *Globe*, 17 May 1856, reports some cries of "hear, hear, and laughter from the opposition."
104. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
105. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
106. *Ibid.*

107. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
108. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
109. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
110. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
111. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
112. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
113. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
114. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
115. *Ibid.*
116. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
117. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
118. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
119. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
120. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
121. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
122. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
123. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
124. *Ibid.*
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Ibid.*
127. *Ibid.*
128. *Ibid.*
129. *Ibid.*
130. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
131. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*
134. *Ibid.*
135. *Montreal Gazette*, 21 May 1856.
136. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
139. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
140. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
141. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
142. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
143. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
144. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
145. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
146. *Ibid.*
147. *Ibid.*
148. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
149. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856.
150. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
151. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856.
152. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856. In a commentary, *Globe*, 17 May 1856, notes that Mr. Spence "spoke between two and three hours."
153. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
154. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
155. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
156. *Ibid.*
157. *Globe*, 17 May 1856. The discussion referred to here took place on Monday, 5 May 1856 (see Volume XIII, Part IV, pages 1800-1801).
158. *Globe*, 17 May 1856.
159. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
160. *Ibid.*
161. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.

162. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
163. *Ibid.*
164. *Ibid.*
165. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
166. *Ibid.*
167. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
168. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
169. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
170. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
171. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
172. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
173. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
174. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
175. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
176. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
177. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
178. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
179. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
180. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
181. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
182. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
183. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
184. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
185. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
186. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
187. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856. It is difficult to ascertain the exact moment when Mr. S. Smith made this statement.
188. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
189. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
190. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
191. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
192. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
193. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856, specifies that Mr. Holton "here read the communication, which was simply a statement of the Inspector General's charge."
194. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
195. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
196. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
197. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
198. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
199. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
200. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
201. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
202. *Ibid.*
203. *Ibid.*
204. *Pilot*, 21 May 1856.
205. *Ibid.*
206. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856. *Globe*, 17 May 1856, reports a short commentary on the discussions that took place in the House on 15 and 16 May 1856 regarding Mr. Cayley's charge against Mr. Young.
207. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
208. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
209. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
210. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
211. *Ibid.*
212. *Ibid.*
213. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
214. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856. According to *Globe*, 19 May 1856, Dr. Clarke said that "he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had voted according to the dictates of his own conscience, irrespective of any pecuniary considerations."

215. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
216. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
217. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
218. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
219. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
220. *Ibid.*
221. *Ibid.*
222. *Ibid.*
223. *Ibid.*
224. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
225. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
226. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
227. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
228. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
229. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
230. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
231. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
232. *Ibid.*
233. *Ibid.*
234. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
235. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
236. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
237. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
238. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
239. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
240. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
241. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
242. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
243. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
244. *Globe*, 19 May 1856. In a commentary, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856, remarks that "Mr. Powell's speech was eloquent, truthful and effective; and was received by the House with hearty applause."
245. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
246. *Ibid.*
247. *Ibid.*
248. *Ibid.*
249. *Ibid.*
250. *Ibid.*
251. *Ibid.*
252. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
253. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
254. *Ibid.*
255. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
256. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856, in a commentary, reports a letter from Mr. Dawson of the Crown Lands Department regarding the report of the Committee on Public Accounts.
257. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
258. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
259. *Ibid.*
260. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
261. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
262. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
263. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
264. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
265. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
266. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
267. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.

268. *Globe*, 19 May 1856. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856, reports a commentary regarding the Report of the Committee on Public Accounts and Messrs. Cauchon and Galt's discussion of it.
269. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
270. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
271. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
272. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
273. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
274. *Globe*, 19 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856, reports a summary of this speech in which it is stated that Mr. Cauchon "expressed his readiness to retire from office whenever he should be satisfied that the ministry of which he is a member have forfeited the confidence of the Legislative Assembly, closing with a general defence of the policy and measures supported by himself and colleagues."
275. *Globe*, 19 May 1856.
276. *Morning Chronicle*, 21 May 1856.
277. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. In a commentary, *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856, also notes that Mr. Jackson "took his stand in the spot usually occupied by Mr. Dorion, thus indicating his fitness to lead the Opposition".
278. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
279. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
280. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
281. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
282. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
283. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
284. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
285. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
286. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
287. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
288. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
289. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
290. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
291. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
292. *Ibid.*
293. *Ibid.*
294. *Ibid.*
295. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
296. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
297. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
298. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
299. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
300. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
301. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
302. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
303. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
304. *Ibid.*
305. *Ibid.*
306. *Ibid.*
307. *Ibid.*
308. *Ibid.*
309. *Ibid.*
310. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
311. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
312. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
313. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
314. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
315. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
316. *Ibid.*
317. *Ibid.*
318. *Ibid.*

319. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
320. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
321. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
322. *Ibid.*
323. *Ibid.*
324. *Pilot*, 22 May 1856.
325. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
326. *Ibid.*
327. *Ibid.*
328. *Ibid.*
329. *Ibid.*
330. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856, reports that Mr. Sicotte "told the hon. gentleman [Mr. O'Farrell] that was not a question of order — and hinted to him very plainly that it was unseemly that he should contend for the floor with the Speaker."
331. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
332. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
333. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
334. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
335. *Ibid.*
336. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
337. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
338. *Ibid.*
339. *Ibid.*
340. *Ibid.*
341. *Ibid.*
342. *Ibid.*
343. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
344. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
345. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
346. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
347. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
348. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
349. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
350. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
351. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 19 May 1856.
352. *Ibid.*
353. *Ibid.*
354. *Ibid.*
355. *Ibid.*
356. *Ibid.*
357. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. Commentaries on this debate are reported in *Globe*, 17 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 and 19 May 1856, and *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856.
358. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 17 May 1856, and *Globe*, 20 May 1856, both report that the House adjourned "shortly before one o'clock".

MONDAY, 19 MAY 1856

(529)

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House, That the Clerk of this House had received from the Deputy Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the following Certificate: —

Province of *Canada*.

This is to certify, that in virtue of a Writ of Election dated the seventeenth day of April last past, issued by His Excellency the Governor General, and addressed to the Registrar of the County of *Two Mountains*, *Daniel de Hertel*, Esquire, Returning Officer *ex officio* for the County of *Argenteuil*, for the election of a Member to represent the said County of *Argenteuil* in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in the room of *Sydney Bellingham*, Esquire, whose election as the Representative of the said County of *Argenteuil* had been declared void, *Sydney Bellingham*, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected accordingly, as appears by the Return to the said Writ of Election, dated the twelfth day of May instant, which is now lodged of record in this Office.

Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,
Toronto, 16th May, 1856.

L.R. Fortier,
Deputy Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

William Burns Lindsay, Esquire,
Clerk, Legislative Assembly, *Toronto*.

Mr. Speaker laid before the House, Return from the Registrar of the County of *Leeds*, pursuant to Act 16 *Vic. cap.* 187, sec. 9, for the year 1855.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 3.)

And also, Statement of the Affairs of the *Cobourg* and *Peterborough* Railway Company, to 1st March, 1856.

For the said Statement, see Appendix (No. 13.)

(530)

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Darche*, — The Petition of *Pierre Doray* and others, of *Laprairie*.

By Mr. *Jean Baptiste Daoust*, — The Petition of *L'Institut Canadien des Artisans de Ste. Scholastique*; and the Petition of *William Robertson* and others, of the County of *Argenteuil*.

By Mr. *Larwill*, — The Petition of *Richard Monck* and others, Bailiffs of Division Courts in *Upper Canada*.

By Mr. *Bell*, — Two Petitions of the Reverend *James Smith* and others, of the ... Township of *Ramsay*.

By Mr. *Brown*, — The Petition of *William Heron* and others, of *Ashburn*; and the Petition of *Peter Robertson* and others, of the Township of *Thurlow*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of *John Graybiel* and others, of the Township of *Humberstone*, County of *Welland*; and of *J.S. Price* and others, of the Township of *Pelham*, County of *Welland*; praying that representation may be based upon population.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Gervais*, County of *Bellechasse*; praying that the said County may not be annexed to the County of *Bellechasse* for Judicial purposes.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Gervais*, County of *Bellechasse*; praying that no further guarantee may be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Of the Municipality of the United Townships of *Verulam* and *Sommerville*; praying that the County of *Victoria* may be separated from the County of *Peterborough* for Judicial purposes, and that the Town of *Lindsay* may be made the County Town of the County of *Victoria*.

Of *Donald McDonald* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; of *Ebenezer Turrill* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; of *John O. Gorman* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; of *Henry Burgess* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; of *John Tucker* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; and of *H. Purdy* and others, of the Township of *Mosa* and other Townships; praying that in the event of the Townships of *Mosa*, *Ekfrid*, *Metcalf*, *Brooke*, *Euphemia*, *Aldborough* and *Zone*, being erected into a new County, that the Village of *Newburg* may be made the County Town.

Of *Andrew McGregor* and others, of *St. Andrews*; praying for certain amendments to the Customs Duties Act.

Of the Reverend *N. Beaubien* and others, of the Village of *Fraserville* and other places; of *Abraham Pelletier* and others, of the Parish of *St. George de Kakouna*; of *Antoine Fortin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Arsène*, County of *Temiscouata*; of *T. Michaud* and others, of the Parish of *St. André*, County of *Kamouraska*; of *P. Fournier* and others, of the Parish of *Trois Pistoles*; and of *Pierre Couturier*, senior, and others, of the Townships of *Whitworth* and *Viger*, County of *Temiscouata*; praying that *Rivière du Loup* may be made the chief place of the *Kamouraska* District for Judicial purposes.

Of *A. Grant* and others, of the Township of *London*; praying for the abolition of Sunday labor in the Post Office Department, and on the *St. Lawrence* Canals.

Of *Robert Burns* and others, of the County of *Middlesex*; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of *William Fraser* and others, of the Townships of *Kilkenny* and *Beauport*, County of *Montcalm*; praying for aid to open out a Road.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of *Argenteuil*; praying that the Bill to erect part of *Chatham* into a Municipality may become Law.

Of *John R. Dickson* and others; praying for the passing of an Act repealing the 39th Clause of the 14 & 15 *Vic. cap. 2*, and substituting one similar to the 35th Clause of the 4 *Will. 4 cap. 36*.

Of the Municipality of the Township of *Townsend*; praying for an Act of Incorporation to construct a line of Railway from *Simcoe* to some point on the Great Western Railway, at or near *Fairchild's Creek*.

On motion of Mr. *Taché*, seconded by Mr. *Southwick*,

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Reports of the Joint Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly for the direction of the Library of Parliament.

The Honorable Mr. *Cartier*, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, delivered to Mr. Speaker two Messages from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by His Excellency.

And the said Messages were read by Mr. Speaker, all the Members of the House being uncovered; and are as follow: —

Edmund Head.

The Governor General lays before the Legislative Assembly, a Copy of a Despatch which he has received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Government House,

Toronto, C.W. May 19th, 1856.

No. 79. — (Copy.)

Downing Street, 2nd May, 1856.

Sir, — You are aware that the Treaty of Peace provides for the prompt evacuation by Her Majesty's Forces, of the Foreign Territories at present held by them; and that among other arrangements for the distribution of the Army on its return from active service, orders have been given that five Regiments shall be selected to be stationed in *British North America*; of which, three are allotted to *Canada*.

2. Such an amount of Force is not of a character to afford much room for misconception as to the purpose of Her Majesty's Government; but still, I think it better to address to you a few remarks in explanation of that purpose.

3. Earl Grey's Despatch to Lord Elgin, of the 14th March, 1851, laid down the principles which were then adopted by Her Majesty's Government, in regard to their Colonial policy, considered in a Military point of view; and in reserving to the Mother Country the duty of maintaining Garrisons for Fortresses of chief importance, such as *Quebec*, invited the co-operation of the Province for the auxiliary measures of defence.

The vigor with which at this moment a Militia force is being organized, justifies our continuing to place, as we do place, the fullest reliance on this policy.

4. It is not of course to be expected that the force of the Garrisons alluded to should be at all times of an unvarying strength. It may vary occasionally from Military or Political reasons.

During the War just ended, when the chief Military strength of the Empire had to be concentrated for the operations in the East, Regiments stationed in *Canada* were withdrawn; and as my predecessor, Sir George Grey, explained in a Despatch, dated 11th August, 1854, increased responsibility was thrown upon the Province. That emergency has now happily passed away; but although the regular Soldiers in *Canada* may be more or fewer at any particular time, the policy of Her Majesty's Government continues the same, and they desire to place their main dependence on the well proved loyalty and courage of Her Majesty's *Canadian* Subjects to repel any hostile aggression, should the occasion ever unfortunately occur; although, in that event, Her Majesty's Government would not fail to give to the Province the full support of the whole power of the *British* Empire.

(532)

5. You will take care that no misapprehension on this subject shall exist in *Canada* which might produce any relaxation of the honorable exertions which the Province is now making to establish a suitable Military organization. I have had the greatest satisfaction in submitting to Her Majesty the accounts which you have transmitted to me, of the spirit and energy with which all classes of Her *Canadian* Subjects have come forward to carry into effect the provisions of the new Militia Act, and I trust that the result will be that this Local Force will speedily be placed on a footing of permanent efficiency.

I have, &c.

(Signed,)

H. Labouchere.

Governor Sir *E. Head*, Bart,
&c., &c., &c.

Edmund Head.

The Governor General lays before the Legislative Assembly, a Copy of Her Majesty's Proclamation on the conclusion of the Peace.

Government House,

Toronto, C.W. May 19th, 1856.

By the Queen. — A Proclamation.

VICTORIA R.

Whereas a Definitive Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Us and Our Allies and His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of all the *Russias*, was concluded at *Paris* on the Thirtieth day of March last, and the Ratifications thereof have now been duly exchanged: In conformity thereunto, We have thought fit hereby to command that the same be published throughout all our Dominions: And We do declare to all Our loving Subjects Our Will and Pleasure, that the said Treaty of Peace and Friendship be observed inviolably, as well by Sea as by Land, and in all places whatsoever, strictly charging and commanding all Our loving Subjects to take Notice hereof, and to conform themselves thereunto accordingly.

Given at Our Court at *Buckingham* Palace, this Twenty-eighth day of April, in the Year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, and in the Nineteenth Year of Our Reign.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fennings Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery: —

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council have passed the following Bills, without Amendment; viz: —

Bill, intituled, "An Act to legalize a certain School Assessment in the Parish of *St. Christophe d'Arthabaska*:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to facilitate the examination of Candidates for admission to the Notarial Profession in *Lower Canada*:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorize the Municipal Council of the Town of *Chatham* to dispose of the land now set apart for a Cemetery in the said Town:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to vest a certain Road allowance in the Township of *Stamford*, in the Township Council:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to render the Mayor of *Quebec* elective by the Electors of *Quebec*."

And then he withdrew.

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

(533)

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

MR. BOWES resumed the debate on the motion of want of confidence in the Ministry. He expressed his astonishment at the conduct of those who having voted for Quebec as the seat of Government, now censured the Administration for complying with the vote of the majority.¹ [He] said that it is amusing to observe the change which had taken place in the views of the members since the discussion on the permanent Seat of Government question, more particularly the change in the views of the member for L'Assomption, who then said he would vote in favor of Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal or Quebec, rather than have the Seat of Government question as it stood, and the hon. member then voted in favor of Quebec, and now endeavored to shelter himself from the consequences of his own vote. He wished that the member for Essex was in his place; that hon. gentleman had attacked the whole Administrative course, and yet he had since that voted for the Seigniorial Tenure bill, solely in consequence of the information given to him by the Attorney General East. He had also voted for the Legislative Council bill; but had voted against them on the Separate School Act in Quebec; while in this place, he had changed his views, and voted against a measure proposed by the member for Lambton, in accordance with his previous views.² Then came the member for Grey, who during many months had testified the highest confidence in the Postmaster General, whom he had described as the embodiment of the reform principles of Upper Canada, but whom he had attacked on Friday night — why? Was it because the Commissionership of Crown Lands — an office which the member for Grey would no doubt admirably fill. (Hear, hear, and laughter). Honorable gentlemen laughed, but really they seemed to forget that the member for Grey had had some practice in this department, in a small way to be sure, but still the taste was formed — was it, he would ask because the Commissionership of Crown Lands is unattainable that the member for Grey had become so indignant against the Postmaster General?³ He (Mr. Bowes) had all along opposed the permanent principle, in regard to a seat of government, but he should support the Government in carrying out the will of the house.⁴ [He then] reviewed at much length the arguments which had been advanced by the opposition during the debate. One of the most fertile of those, was, he considered, that advanced by the hon. member for Northumberland, that the present coalition Government had carried all those great measures for which they had been installed in office — such as the Clergy Reserves, the Legislative Council, the Seigniorial Tenure, and Militia Bills, that they had carried out all the objects for which the Reformers had placed them in office — and therefore they might resign. Now, he entirely differed with the hon. gentleman in his conclusion. Their having passed such great and long vexed measures, instead of being an argument for their resignation, it entitled them to the fullest confidence of that House and the country. He would like to ask the hon. member for Peterborough, if he could sympathize with such cold-blooded remarks? Or could the hon. member for Durham do so? He rather thought not. Was Dr. Southwick

prepared to sanction such a reason for the Reformers withholding their confidence from the present Government? He thought not. And when the vote was taken on this motion, it would be seen how much such illiberal attacks were esteemed. He should vote against the amendment, and reserve his opinion regarding the £50,000 grant if it came up.⁵

MR. GALT called the attention of the Government to a recent extensive circulation of Stanstead Bank bills throughout the Province. He regretted the interruption of the debate at this stage, but the matter to which he now called the attention of the Administration was too urgent to admit of further delay. These notes had, as he had stated, been very extensively circulated both in and out of the Province, and yet no person not even in Stanstead itself, save those immediately concerned, had any knowledge of the bank or the bankers.⁶ The member for Stanstead (Mr. Terrill), who had just arrived from that district, informed him that the people there had no knowledge of the existence of this bank, up to yesterday (Sunday) week. It purported to be organized under the Free Banking Act, and the notes, he was informed, were endorsed by the Registrar of the Province, in the usual way. He was told they had got into circulation by the deposit of municipal debentures in the proper department, in exchange for the notes. What caused suspicion was that a week ago, the inhabitants of Stanstead had no knowledge of the existence of the bank or of the intention to establish it, while, at the same time, attempts were made to put the notes in circulation all over the Province,⁷ in Toronto, in the towns between Toronto and Montreal, in the latter city, and the Eastern Townships⁸. He thought it very important that the attention of the Government should be directed to this matter⁹, [and] that any information possessed by the government on this point, should be stated to the House¹⁰. For, if there was one thing more than another, of which they had reason to be proud, it was the position and solvency of their banking institutions, and it would be a thing very much to be regretted if the Free Banking Act should afford facilities for strangers to the country coming in and setting afloat a large quantity of inconvertible paper. Those municipal securities could be bought at a discount so high as 10 or 12 per cent.; and if parties bought them at that discount, and received in exchange notes at par, there was no security for the redemption at par of the notes themselves. It would be much to be regretted if this should be the case with notes, professing to bear the endorsement of the Province, while there was no guarantee for redeeming them.¹¹ The circulation of the notes of this Stanstead Bank created much alarm in the commercial community in this city and elsewhere, but he hoped the Government would be able to allay those fears.¹²

MR. TERRILL said he was quite unable to afford any information as to the institution spoken of. All he knew of it was, that on Sunday week, certain individuals, entire strangers in the country, never heard of in the country before, came to Stanstead¹³ [with] a large number of notes in their pockets, and announced their intention to establish a bank¹⁴. Some weeks before, he had seen in the New York *Tribune*, a statement about a Provincial Bank about to be established in Toronto, and subsequently he learned from a broker in Toronto, that such an institution was in progress of being established, but he knew nothing of the parties concerned in it, and he was sure, that up to yesterday week, not a single individual in Stanstead except himself, knew that it was to be established. He was told the notes were in circulation in almost every part of Canada. They had been put in circulation also in Buffalo. He would not seek to cast suspicions on those parties one way or another, but he must say that he had felt it to be very unbusiness like, for gentlemen from a foreign country, to plant themselves down on the frontier in a by-corner of Lower Canada, to establish the business of banking in a place to which they were strangers, and which they had not previously visited to ascertain whether it afforded a fair field for banking operations or not. And he felt it all the more keenly, after the great efforts he had had to put forth to obtain a charter for a Bank at Stanstead, and which charter was still lying unused. He understood the parties were negotiating for the purchase of a Banking House, but up to Thursday last, no office had been opened where the notes could be presented for redemption.¹⁵ Such a course, was to say the least of it, extraordinary and unbusiness-like. (Hear, hear.)¹⁶ The law ought to be repealed. It could not be worked profitably by any bankers

in connection with existing charters, and it did not afford proper security to bill-holders.¹⁷ As had been mentioned by the member for Sherbrooke, Lower Canada Municipal Loan Fund Debentures could be purchased at a cheaper rate than those of Upper Canada — at a discount of 10 or 12½ per cent. And he had been told, though he could not vouch for it, that these parties had purchased Debentures at a discount, and that £10,000 in cash would be realized by them as a direct premium, if they could put their notes in circulation. They could redeem a little from time to time, to give an appearance of stability to their institution, and then the moment the whole of their notes were put in circulation, they could shut the door of their Banking House, and the only security for the bill-holders was the debentures, which could only be sold at a discount¹⁸. The holders of the paper could only realize 75 per cent of their amount. The Brokers might fraud[ul]ently pocket 12½ per cent, and the other 12½ per cent¹⁹ would be swallowed in the expenses of winding up the institution. He regretted that the free banking law had not been repealed prior to the circumstances having arisen which they were now dealing with, although he admitted that there would not be the same objection to its provisions being taken advantage of by parties well known in the country, having a provincial reputation, and a credit on which reliance could be placed.²⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY was exceedingly obliged to the members for Sherbrooke and Stanstead for having brought this matter forward. So far as he could learn, these parties had complied with the conditions of the Act. He had on a former occasion stated that he was not favourable to the Free Banking system²¹. When it was first discussed in the House the hon. member for Haldimand expressed the opinion that under a free banking system the security to the public would be much greater than under chartered banks. He (Mr. Cayley,) took the opportunity to differ from that hon. gentleman. The alterations he had made in the act by his bill of this session were for the purpose of preventing any individuals from taking advantage of the act unless they produced a capital of £25,000. Previously, there was no restriction [at] all.²² These notes had been properly drawn, and the attention of the law officers of the Crown was particularly drawn to them by the Auditor, who himself felt some anxiety about it, but every thing seemed to have been done that the law required.²³ Why Stanstead was selected as the sc[e]ne of their operations he could not say. Some few days ago a broker came to him with respect to these bills to ascertain if they were correct.²⁴ He replied, “no doubt the proper security has been lodged; but if you ask me my opinion as to what I should do, I would say that, before I attempted to negotiate those securities to a large extent, I would send those notes down to Stanstead to be presented to the bank, so as to ascertain whether they are prepared to redeem them.” Subsequently he was called upon by some of the parties themselves to compel the custom house officers to receive their notes, and he replied that unless he was advised by the law officers of the Crown that it was compulsory on him, he could give no such instructions.²⁵

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB was here carried into the House on a chair and set down at the Speaker's right hand, amidst the cheers of the assembly.²⁶

MR. BROWN immediately crossed the floor and shook hands with the hon. and gallant knight, and was followed by several of the other members.²⁷

MR. HOLTON, in reply to the Inspector General said, whatever the merits or demerits of this free banking system, they ought not to be allowed to obtain depreciated securities and pass them off at par. He did not think the Government entirely free from blame in allowing these things to exist so long.²⁸

Laughter from the ministerial benches.²⁹

[MR. HOLTON continued:] The Solicitor General laughs, but he (Mr. Holton) would explain his position.³⁰ Originally, the basis of circulation of notes was the Provincial Debentures, founded upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Province. Those Debentures have always, since the passage of the law, bore a premium — and they still did so. Subsequently, if he did not mistake, at the establishment

of the Municipal Loan Fund by Mr. Hincks' Government, which was long subsequent to the passage of the Free Banking Law, the provisions of that law were extended to that fund, and the debentures were made the basis of banking operations, and they remained at par³¹ and sometimes above it. But last session the Inspector General introduced a measure to extend the provisions of this law to Lower Canada Municipal debentures, and unfortunately, whether owing to the state of the money market, or to some other cause,³² those debentures, as well as those of the Upper Canada fund, had been at a very considerable depression throughout the year.³³ These depreciated debentures are therefore brought up and treated by the parties in this banking operation as worth par.³⁴ Now it must be manifest that it was within the power of the Government, and their duty, that the moment those debentures ceased to command their par value in the market, to alter their value for banking purposes — to require a larger nominal amount of security and deposit, if the debentures were to be continued as the basis of banking operations, than their par value. The present operation of the law was such, that people might put into their pockets 10 or 12½ per cent, upon every exchange effected. This was clearly not a state of things which ought to exist; the Government was responsible for it. The value of these debentures was a matter of enquiry. They cannot be in ignorance; and if the public suffer by their being allowed to be improperly a basis of banking circulation for more than their market value, of course the Government are responsible therefor. He did not make this statement at random. He did not intend to censure the Government for not having met the case before.³⁵ That was not the point he rose to urge. He rose for the purpose of suggesting that the government should instantly bring in a measure to amend the Banking Act, to prevent such things for the future.³⁶ He went on to explain that in this very case, as he understood, securities had been bought at a discount of 12½ per cent and deposited as representing the full amount on their face, and notes given for them upon that basis; then they went into the market with these notes, bought more securities and deposited them, received a new supply of notes, thus making 12½ per cent on each transaction. These securities should only be received as a basis for banking issues at their market value. Now, they received \$100 notes for every \$87½ or \$90 of value of securities deposited; but he had learned a farther circumstance which went to show that these parties were in bad faith.³⁷ Since this subject came up, he had had put into his hands a statement showing the operation in this particular case, and there must be some bad faith in the matter, and the circumstances were not only suspicious — going to prove that there are issues of paper money not bearing the counter-signature of the proper officer, which are attempted to be put in circulation, alongside of that which does bear his counter-signature. (Hear, hear.) That fact alone showed the way in which the law might be abused. He had not looked at the provisions of the Free Banking Law very recently³⁸, but he was under the impression that the parties had to go before the Receiver General with their notes and get them countersigned.³⁹ That parties were required to go through certain formalities, register themselves, and indicate their residences, in order to entitle them to an issue of Bank-notes from the Government department — and if an application came before it, under suspicious circumstances, from non-residents, having no connection with the country, with the view of establishing a bank in a small remote town — that fact alone should have induced some caution, upon the part of the Inspector General, before allowing such notes to pass into circulation. He would read a paper which had been placed in his hands, on the genuineness of some notes presented to a large establishment in this city, who, not knowing the names thereof, and seeing that they were neither counter-signed, on the face or back thereof, by the Clerk authorised by the Inspector General, advised the parties to refuse them. He (Mr. Holton) subsequently obtained from a gentleman a genuine note of the Bank in question, and, on examining it, he found that it was countersigned by the proper officer. In the meantime, another party had taken one of the bad notes, and, upon examination, he found that the only difference between the genuine and spurious paper[s], was the omission, on the face, of the required signature of the Inspector General's office.⁴⁰

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH, said he had allowed his risible faculties to play — not at the remarks which the hon. gentleman was making, but at the peculiar time which had been chosen by hon. gentlemen to bring up this subject⁴¹. It might have been brought forward at any other time, but it was no doubt

peculiarly convenient to the hon. member[s] to bring it up pending this discussion, and the hon. members must need abuse the Government because that certain spurious bills had been issued. (Hear, hear.) What had the Government to do with it? There was just as little weight in the effect of the observations of both of the hon. gentlemen put together upon this matter, as there was in the observations presented by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton) when he presented his flaring report from the Committee on Public Accounts.⁴²

MR. GALT denied the insinuation of the Solicitor General that this was brought up to embarrass the Government. He considered it his duty to bring the motion before the House at the earliest possible opportunity, as it was necessary to call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that such notes were in circulation.⁴³ The Solicitor General West might consider this matter as of no consequence; but when the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Terrill) only arrived here to-day, and when it was only to-day that the proper evidence was obtained, it was not for the law officer of the Crown to rebuke an hon. member for bringing the matter before the house and country. He (Mr. Galt) by no means felt himself open to the censure of the Solicitor General, as he thought he had done his duty.⁴⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the Solicitor General referred more particularly to the remarks made by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton).⁴⁵ [He] was glad the hon. member for Montreal had so great confidence in the Government as to ask them to bring in immediately a Bill to amend this Act. He thought, however,⁴⁶ if that hon. member had acted as the hon. member for Sherbrooke had, and discussed the question fairly, instead of censuring the Government, it would have been well enough. But the hon. member for Montreal was too disposed to blame the Government? He was sure that he had not looked to the Free Banking Act before he so censured the Government, then he would have found that the Government were not so much to blame. Debentures issued under the Municipal Loan Fund Act were debentures of the Province.⁴⁷

MR. HOLTON asked if the principal and interest of that fund was guaranteed by the Province?⁴⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied, that a decision of the courts would be necessary to establish what the legal liabilities of the Province are in that respect. (Laughter.)⁴⁹ The hon. gentleman was in error in supposing that certain pre-requisites were required before parties could take advantage of this Act. Such was not the case.⁵⁰ The Inspector General had only one course to pursue; that any individual or person wishing to become bankers, upon giving the proper security, had a right to have his counter-signing, and he could not refuse it. Any number of individuals could form a co-partnership, and, if they did not seek to make themselves a corporation, they could act as individuals, and be looked upon as a private bank.⁵¹

MR. HOLTON enquired how it was in this particular case?⁵²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied. He was not aware. He had no doubt that the Inspector General would be able to give the necessary information. Whether they were acting as a corporation or as individual bankers he was not prepared to say. The Government had only carried out the requirements of the Free Banking Act. They could not do anything else; and it was for this house to say whether the provisions of that Act were sufficient or not.⁵³

MR. FELTON said it was amusing to find the anxiety of the hon. member for Montreal to count this matter into a grievance ag[a]inst the Government. These parties were simply doing what might be done at any time and in defiance of all law; it was an act amounting in fact to forgery. He did not think it was necessary to bring this matter up in this way.⁵⁴ No action could be taken upon it. The public being warned on the subject of the issue of the notes, was all that was necessary.⁵⁵ The Government was not

responsible, and could not prevent it. The act was a perfectly legal one so far as the issue of the notes, bearing the signature of the proper office[r]. It was wrong to issue other than an exact counterpart, without that signature. The probability was that these ... notes had been struck from different plates. This operation could not be reached by the law.⁵⁶

MR. TERRILL was quite sure that neither the hon. member for Sherbrooke or himself had any desire to bring forward this matter now, to perplex the Government. They wished to forewarn the country, that was all (hear, hear); and he was not disposed to think that the government would censure them, except in that particular. His own opinion was, that there were provisions made in the original law, or some of its amendments, which goes [sic] to depreciate securities which, being the basis of banking, are to be received at their value; but he thought it to be the duty of the Government, if they saw that this evil was likely to arise, and that the door was open to the practice of frauds, not in this particular case only, but it was their duty to repeal that law. He had always, since 1851, been of opinion that it should be repealed, and now they had an evidence of the necessity for doing so. He was not aware before to-night that any notes had been put in circulation without being counter-signed by the public officer. But he wished to call the attention of the Government to this fact. He was told that the notes signed were not signed by any responsible persons in the Inspector General's department. (Hear, hear.) Now there was no individual at all responsible to the public in this matter, in one way or the other, as he understood.⁵⁷ He did not suppose that, so soon as this, any of these notes would be attempted to be put in circulation without being properly countersigned, but here was such a case; and it was necessary therefore for the Government to take immediate action in the matter, in order to protect the public. This Free Banking Law was passed in 1851, and it had not given any great satisfaction since. It should therefore be repealed.⁵⁸

MR. MERRITT asked what was the question.⁵⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the first Order of the Day would be called.⁶⁰

(533)

The House then resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, on Thursday last, proposed to be made to the proposed Amendment to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply);

And which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, conveying to him the expression that the position which His Excellency's Administration have assumed up to the present day, on the Question of the Seat of Government, does not inspire this House with the confidence necessary to entrust the Administration with the moneys required for the construction of the necessary Buildings at the Seat of Government" inserted instead thereof;

And which Amendment to the said proposed Amendment was, That the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, conveying to him the expression that the position which His Excellency's Administration have assumed up to the present day, on the Question of the Seat of Government, does not inspire this House with the confidence necessary to entrust the Administration with the moneys required for the construction of the necessary Buildings at the Seat of Government" be left out, and the words, "the course of the Administration with reference to the Question of the Seat of Government and other important Public Questions has disappointed the just expectation of the great majority of the People of this Province" inserted instead thereof.

MR. WILSON said any one would have supposed from speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the hon. member for Lambton was on his trial.⁶¹ [He] was sorry to find the Postmaster General deviating from his usual practice. The hon. gentleman had ventured to say that upon one occasion the hon. member for Lambton had had the bad judgment to appear⁶² as accuser, witness, prosecutor, and Judge. That he (Mr. Wilson) supposed was on the occasion of the white-washing committee of last

session.⁶³ Supposing that to be the case he (Mr. W.) was afraid that the charge respecting that matter would lie very well at the door of the Inspector General, for if he did not forget very much, the hon. member sat in that house as one of the accusers of a member of that Government to whom the charge was made, that the Government itself and those who supported it, were steeped to the lips in corruption.⁶⁴ It ill became them, therefore, to charge the hon. member for Lambton with their white-washing. Hon. gent. had referred to the formation of this coalition Government; but whatever opinion may be formed of it, there was no doubt that it was⁶⁵ from the first a matter of bargain, sale, and arrangement.⁶⁶ (Hear, hear.) In that view it had always stood before the country, and it was looked upon with contempt.⁶⁷ One of the agreements was that those representatives who supported the gentlemen should receive the patronage of their countries [sic]. Another condition was that they should take up the measures which the previous Government had prepared, and which they themselves while in opposition had clamoured against. They pledged themselves to carry out their measures, and how had they done so? Was the Government satisfied with the spirit in which they were carried out? As an evidence to the contrary, he had simply to say that the bills that were carried out [were] not the bills that were left to them by the previous Government.⁶⁸ Was the country satisfied with them? (Oh, oh!) Which of them? (Cries of "all of them".) None of them. (Hear, hear.)⁶⁹ Had they carried out the Elective Council bill to the satisfaction of the country? (Cheers and cries of yes.) Had they carried out the Seigniorial bill? (Cries of yes, yes.) Then, if they had, the first bill introduced by the Attorney General was a perfect mockery, and so with regard to the Clergy Reserves. But he would take the members of the Administration at the heads of their departments.⁷⁰ The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had defended their own Bureaus, and he was rather surprised at the defence made by the hon. Commissioner for Crown Lands. If every officer at the head of the departments acted as that hon. gentleman did, he would meet with deserved contempt, for he had⁷¹ [so degraded] his department that no officer of manliness or spirit would remain in it. These officers were not the menials of the political head[s] of departments for the time being. But they were the permanent heads of the departments, gentlemen intrusted with all the secrets connected with the affairs of the Province, and who in consideration of their conducting the business of the country ought to be respectfully treated. Yet men who had spent their whole lives in the service of the public were treated by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, as if they were unworthy of the slightest confidence — shut up in separate rooms, so that they might not be permitted to speak to each other — and in fact degraded in such a way that no person of spirit would hold office under such a tenure. The hon. gentleman then referred to the Postmaster Gen.⁷², [who] took a great deal of pains in defending his department, as if he were the person who originated it. The Province knew long before that hon. gentleman came there, that that department possessed some of the best officers in the land or in Europe. The hon. gentleman had paraded it before the country that the department was in the most perfect order through his untiring energy.⁷³ He, however, did not desire to find any fault with the Administrative capacities of that gentlemen [sic], it was his political conduct that he censured.⁷⁴ He then referred to the position the Inspector General had placed himself in, with regard to the Grand Trunk. His coming down to the House and demanding 25 per cent. increase to the customs duties, with a view to pay the January dividends on the Provincial bonds, while he should have known that interest was paid.⁷⁵ The house was assured that the statements which that hon. gentleman made at first in reference to the Grand Trunk Railroad, was the first intimation which that hon. gentleman had had of any kind of difficulty upon that sbbject [sic]. But if it were so, he could not have been attending to his duties as a Railroad Director of that company, for if he had, he must have known how its affairs were, and that they were embarrassed, and yet he told the house that the news came upon him like a "thunderbolt." Now this house, without the slightest hesitation consented to the increase of taxation to meet the extraordinary demand made by the astounding fact, that this government was to provide for the payment of the next July interest. Nobody on the Opposition side had uttered a word against meeting any demand which could be properly made against [the] Government. Was it not then expected that the Inspector General should intimate to the house, that the Government meant to help the Company over their difficulties. Up to this time the house had had no scheme for this brought before

it. And was it now to be said at this period of the session, that such help was to be given without [sic] the house knowing what it was about. They were now called upon to pay a fifth of the revenue of the Province as interest of the fund advanced to this company, and up to this hour the government had not declared what they meant to do in reference to it. The country would not be satisfied with such a state of things. Then as to this Seat of Government question. The house had declared that this perambulatory system should cease; and the Government should have come down with a measure of their own for fixing it at a particular city⁷⁶. If they could not fix upon any one of the places which had been spoken of, they should appeal to the country upon it. He wondered that the members from Lower Canada, who desired that the Union should last, should vote for Quebec; for they must see that Upper Canada would never consent to Quebec being the Seat of Government, and so long as it was so, it would always be a bone of contention that would in the end imperil the Union.⁷⁷ He referred to the votes of confidence which the Government boasted of having received. If the vote on the Duval case was one of these he (Mr. Wilson) considered that vote a standing stigma on the Ministry.⁷⁸ Then, with regard to the position taken by the member for Niagara, he could only speak of that with pain, for there was no man in the House who was so highly thought of as that hon. gentleman; but what had been the conduct of that gentleman?⁷⁹ It was suggested at a caucus meeting of Reformers who supported the Government, that it was necessary for Sir Allan MacNab to resign, and it was said that the hon. member for Niagara had most warmly insisted upon it. A deputation waited upon the hon. and gallant knight, and he gave them a proper answer, "that he would see them at that place first" — (laughter,) — "which did not require mention." (Laughter.)⁸⁰ And it was just such an answer as he could have told them the gallant member would give them, and he would go further and say, that the only thing that could sustain the Government was the gallant Knight continuing as its leader.⁸¹ But what a wonderful change had since come over the hon. member for Niagara. He was now content not only to allow the hon. and gallant knight to remain in, but for himself to become a colleague of his, holding his seat in the Government, without a department, a salary, or going back to his constituents. What responsible government was there in the house? Their actions would stamp them with infamy.⁸² The Postmaster General, ... in speaking of Mr. Baldwin, had said that he resigned from an over refined order of delicacy on the Chancery question. It was quite clear that the Postmaster General did not possess that refined sense of propriety, for he did not resign when he had an Upper Canadian majority against him. He had always agitated the country against Mr. Baldwin, because he did not carry out the platform to which he (Mr. Spence) had assented, which spoke of secularisation, abolition of the rectories, election of county officers, no sectarian education — vote by ballot — abolition of the Court of Chancery — election of legislative Council — retrenchment in the public expenditure. At the Watertown [sic] convention the Postmaster General assented to all these principles, and to prove this he read⁸³ letters signed by eighteen of the delegates to that convention, declaring that the Postmaster General had given his assent to the entire platform.... He [also] produced the ... platform of 1851, all the planks of which he read and commented upon separately, asking the Postmaster Gen. at the close of each comment whether he had carried out that plank.⁸⁴ Had that gentleman done anything to support these principles since he came to the office? Had he not voted against the election of county officers the other night, and had he brought in a bill to do away with the rectories which he had so strongly blamed Mr. Baldwin for not doing?⁸⁵ [Mr. Wilson then asked] where was the Police Bill of the Government. (Hear, hear.) It was a mystery what had become of it. The whole course of the Government upon the seat of Government question was of such a nature that the country would look upon them with contempt. Instead of coming [sic] down with a scheme of their own, they had allowed the matter to be taken up in an irregular and objectionable manner.⁸⁶ [He referred] to the retrenchment which nearly all the members of the Administration while in opposition had clamoured for — and while the previous Ministry in obedience to the wishes of the country had reduced their salaries to [sic] £800. The present Government had raised their salaries to £1,250, the principle in connexion with the salaries of Ministers was that they should be the same as that of the Judges — but these hon. gentleman [sic] while they had raised their own salaries had entirely forgotten the Judges.⁸⁷ With regard to the Grand Trunk, he would hold up both hands to

sustain the credit of the country and place this undertaking on a proper footing, but he said that the government should come down with some scheme; surely they were not going to prorogue the House without giving them some plan for this purpose. The Inspector General had proposed a scheme which had been justly refused, because it was only a plan to obtain votes for themselves.⁸⁸ At the opening of the session, he [Mr. Wilson] had said that he was not disposed to look upon the Government in the character of menial servants of this house, as the member for Essex put it. He would rather say, that they ought to be men of high statesmanship, guiding themselves by some standard of statesmanship, such as that of Baldwin and Draper. Those gentlemen never were guilty of indiscretions like those which had characterized their successors this session. Mr. Draper, of whom the present Inspector General was at one time a colleague, used to cut his opponents, but he cut them with the practised skill of a gladiator, and not with the rude attack of an untutored barbarian. (Hear, hear.) The other gentleman, Mr. Baldwin, when his colleagues did not sustain him, or the house did not sustain him, or the least censure was cast on his conduct, left those Benches, and would not hold office for a moment under a tenure that would disgrace him as a man and as a politician. (Hear, hear.) Whatever the vote of the house might be on the motion now before it, of one thing he was certain that the Government was held in contempt and detestation by the whole country. (Hear, hear.)⁸⁹

MR. SANBORN said he had no idea of taking up the time of the House with any remarks upon this motion, but as it had already occupied three sittings of the House, and as it was likely to call out the opin[i]ons of nearly all honorable members, he felt under the necessity of saying something in regard to the position he intended to take. As some honorable members had referred to the formation of the present coalition Government, he hoped to be permitted to go back to some of the points connected with that motion. The hon. gentleman then commenced with the Baldwin Lafontain[e] Administration, and gave a brief review of the proceedings which resulted up to the time of the formation of the present coalition, which he looked upon as conceived in deception⁹⁰. He said he recollected well how when the present Postmaster General rose to announce that he was to take office in the administration as a representative of Mr. Hincks, the announcement was received with ironical cheers by those who were acquainted with the circumstances of his election. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Sanborn) came into this Parliament as a supporter of the Hincks Government, which was overthrown to a great extent by the strenuous [sic] efforts of the Tory party under the lead of Sir Allan MacNab. A proposal was then made that a coalition government should be formed, to be supported by the Tory party, and by the supporters of the Hincks administration. But in what position did that proposal place him and other Reformers who had come into Parliament to support a Reform government, and where [sic] then called upon to range themselves under the leadership of Sir Allan MacNab? It placed them in the position of the patriarch, who, after working for seven years to get Rachel to wife, woke in the morning and found that he had got, not Rachel, but Leah. (Laughter.)⁹¹ [He then referred to the Grand Trunk scheme, saying] it was no matter now how this railroad was got up, this country must get out of the transaction honorably. He would raise both hands in support of any scheme that would do so; but he wanted to see this scheme from Government. The hon. gentleman after some allusions to the Railway Omnibus of the Inspector General, concluded by saying whatever the vote of the House on this occasion should be, it would not retrieve the Government from their difficulties, because they are held in utter detestation throughout the country.⁹²

[After the recess,]

MR. SANBORN resumed. — The present Government was the device of the minority to circumvent the majority of the House. That minority was the Conservative section of the present Government. They had offered to accept the seals of office and carry out the questions then before the country, and that proposition had been accepted by the majority, the Reformers of the House. This proposition involved a

relinquishment by the Conservatives of the principle[s] they had long professed, and so complete [sic] was this relinquishment that⁹³ the Attorney General West and others of his colleagues were placed in the humiliating position of having silently to vote down the identical resolutions which they had themselves moved the year before, when in opposition to the previous government.⁹⁴ The hon. gentleman proceeded to cite the different questions upon which the Conservatives in the Cabinet had received [sic] their positions and opinions.⁹⁵ [He] dwelt at some length upon the Elective Legislative Council Bill which, while he would not say whether the measure passed met the wishes of the country or not, was one which had specially invoked the opposition of those gentlemen, but nevertheless they consented to undertake its passage — and with the aid of a portion of the Reform party, succeeded in bringing it through. The Conservatives had abandoned the principles of a life time, and had disappointed those who had sent them to Parliament to represent other and widely different views.⁹⁶ But those measures Mr. Hincks ordered them to carry through, and, to use his own words, like whipped spaniels they submissively carried out his behests. As a consideration for their submissiveness and sacrifice of principle, they obtained a foothold by which, after carrying those measures, they expected to gain strength as a party, and entirely to break up the Reform party.⁹⁷ They circumvented the majority of the House, and the Reformers who had given in their adhesion to the Government, did so at the expense of the principles they most desired to see carried out.⁹⁸ The country was now feeling the consequence of that unprincipled course of procedure. Could respect be entertained for the public character of men who have so acted? He believed that all parties had less confidence in the public character of our public men, in consequence of the bargain they made for the sake of office, than they had formerly.⁹⁹ The men of both parties had seriously erred, and the effect of their erring could not be got over until parties were again reorganized upon distinct party basis, and with fixed political principles.¹⁰⁰ Until both these sections of the Conservatives and Reform[er]s returned to their legitimate course, there would be nothing like sound government. It had been said that the coalition Government was one of necessity, but this he did not believe — at any rate, however, it was now allowed that the present necessity had ceased to exist. It was said on all hands, that this Government had never had the cordial confidence of any party in the House — and the best that had ever been said for it was, that it could not be otherwise, — a mere apology for the support it received.¹⁰¹ There had never been a systematic defence of the ministry on principle. Those who had spoken for it were only its apologists, defending it as a necessity.¹⁰² But he could not see where the necessity had existed. He would ask the Reformers in the House, men who had been returned upon Reform principles,¹⁰³ — was it necessary that a large majority should yield to, and give office to a minority? It was the work of the leading mind of the former Administration, and those who had supported that Administration were wheedled into it, much to their own chagrin. And what had been the effects of the Coalition? It had poisoned the foundations of public opinion, and huddled together men of all creeds and opinions.¹⁰⁴ This patchwork government ... had removed all of the old landmarks, and introduced disorder into the political ideas of the country, so that it was now almost impossible to recognize any distinctive principles, either among the people or their representatives.¹⁰⁵ The opposition were in the habit of being taunted with being disunited; and the ministerial side were represented as presenting the only harmony in the House.¹⁰⁶ But the Opposition were far more united than those who supported the ministry, who had no common bond of principle to unite them together. On what single question could all the parties on the other side unite? The ministerial majority could only be sustained by one party, and another being bought, and bribed, and thus brought up to the mark. (Cries of name! name!) He would not name. Of course, they were all honourable men. (Laughter.) Among the ministry themselves there was disunion. There had not been a week during the session that they had not heard of plots,¹⁰⁷ of cabals and intrigues of parties, resigning and recalling their resignations, of buying and selling support, and, generally, of a state of things indicating the greatest weakness, instability and incompetency.¹⁰⁸ The effect had been seen in the total lack of policy which the Government manifested. It was not for want of talent, for there was talent in the Government¹⁰⁹, [although] it was isolated, and, consequently, of little or no service.¹¹⁰ But it was insisted, it had no party to act upon. The government was utterly disagreed. It was sick and yet it could not die. What

had been the conduct of the Ministry upon questions which had come before the House during the Session.¹¹¹ The discussion on Representation by Population, the Provincial Secretary shut off on a point of order. The Corrigan case came up accidentally, and the ministry not dreading anything, let it go on till it resulted in their defeat. Then they threatened to resign unless the house rescinded its resolution, and the Attorney General East moved accordingly. But they found they could not carry it, and were planning a scheme to get out of the difficulty, when the member for Glengary moved the previous question, to the consternation of the ministry. The house voted that the Attorney General's motion should *not* be put, and the ministry calmly, quietly and resignedly accepted that as a vote of confidence!¹¹² The Government possess the virtue of resignation only in one sense. They are resigned to any insult, but to resign their places, they cannot be induced to do it. Again, upon the Separate School question, they should enunciate a distinct policy. What was the difference between a Government and an Opposition. The former should have a distinct affirmation policy; while the Opposition were required only to criticize that policy.¹¹³ Then how did they meet the matter of Separate Schools? The member for Wolfe moved that the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada, should be placed on the same footing as the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. The ministry would have liked to have adopted this motion, but they had other parties to please, and true to the principle they always go upon, of having no police [sic] of their own, the Postmaster General moved that there should be no interference with things as they are. Subsequently after many years' discussion, a motion was made to postpone the discussion for five weeks, which the Ministry embraced, and the Separate School question was thus shelved for the session. On the important question of the Seat of Government, in which the destinies of the Union were involved, the Ministry were also without a policy.¹¹⁴ They bowed they said to the will of the House when Quebec was named, but it was this continual bowing to necessity or to expediency which rendered them weak and vacillating.¹¹⁵ It was the duty of the Government to lead not to bow to the decision [sic] of the House; and when they found themselves unable to lead the House it was their duty to resign.¹¹⁶ They ought to have taken the responsibility of putting an end to the alternate system, and fixing the Seat of Government permanently in some central locality, as Ottawa,¹¹⁷ though personally he preferred Montreal¹¹⁸, for he considered that Quebec and Toronto, in the eastern and western extremities of the Province respectively, were equally unsuitable localities, if they had respect to the preservation of the Union.¹¹⁹ If they had adopted this manly course, they would have commanded the respect of the House, for no one could regard the ambulating system with favour. Their refusing to do so had led them into the difficulties in which they now found themselves. Then as to the great questions which had been bequeathed to them by their predecessors¹²⁰. The Postmaster General took great credit for the settlement of the Clergy Reserves question. The Government, however, could not claim to be the fathers of the Clergy Reserves measure; they were merely its undertakers. (Hear, hear.) And the measure they carried had given great dissatisfaction throughout the country.¹²¹ It was notorious that the settlement of that question, by the present Government was far from being satisfactory to the Reformers of Upper Canada, who were most interested in its settlement.¹²² The Seigniorial Tenure Bill which they had passed was not the one which they had received from their master — the man who had put them into power (Hincks),¹²³ — and which they had pledged themselves to carry, but a measure containing entirely different principles. (Hear, hear.)¹²⁴ The secret influence, which was so potent in many cases, had changed the bill in the Legislative Council, and with the assistance of the same power it had been accepted in its completely changed form, and so had become law.¹²⁵ The Commissioner for Crown Lands took great credit for the Legislative Council Bill. Now it seemed to be a characteristic [sic] of every measure of the Coalition, that the instrument of carrying it was always placed in the most humiliating position possible. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had all his political life been a great Conservative, and especially an opponent of the Elective principle for the Legislative Council. Yet, when he entered the Ministry, he was the instrument chosen to carry out that principle. The Bill passed, and went to the upper house, and when it came back, was so altered, as to be deprived of at least two-thirds of the elective principle it originally contained. But this house accepted it, and it was for this they were called upon to be thankful to the Government. If it was thought that the elective

principle was the cure for the inefficiency of the present Upper House, it had certainly been applied in a homœopathic dose. (Hear, hear.)¹²⁶ In all these things the minority had lowered themselves, and done themselves more injustice than their worst enemies could have wished them.¹²⁷ If the ... [Conservative] members of the Government remained out of power until these questions were settled, they might then have taken a position in Government with the confidence of the Reformers of the both sections of the Province. They had seen fit to act otherwise, and by doing as they had, forfeited their own characters as politicians. There were other grounds, however, for opposition to the Government. One of the measures introduced and passed, was the Audit Bill, and the Government claimed credit, as for this Bill, as for the gentleman [Mr. Langton] who had been appointed to the head of that department.¹²⁸ [He thought] the whole credit was due to the previous audit bill introduced by Mr. Darche, and the report on public accounts by Mr. Mackenzie.¹²⁹ In respect of the appointment of Mr. Langton to the Audit Office, it had been admitted that his appointment was an excellent one. But the Commissioner of Crown Lands had made a direct and violent attack upon that very excellent officer, because, apparently he had acted as a check upon the accounts of his Department.¹³⁰ The Government were destroying the effect of their Audit Bill, by one of their number coming and attacking the able auditor, on whom so much praise and compliment had been heaped in a former debate by his colleagues.¹³¹ What a commentary this was upon the ministers who had complimented that officer, and what excellent harmony of feeling between them it suggested!¹³² This disclosed a condition of affairs in that ministry by no means calculated to inspire confidence in them on the part of members of this house. He next alluded to the Grand Trunk policy of the Government. He (Mr. S.) had shown by his votes all along that he was no great favourer of that project. Last session the ministry, forced to it by that power which they could not resist (Mr. Hincks) gave additional aid of £900,000.¹³³ They said they had not originated the measure, which was true, but they were responsible for the £900,000 vote,¹³⁴ and it was of no use for them to plead now, that it was a legacy left them by their predecessors¹³⁵; and having committed themselves to the support of that undertaking, they had become so interested as to prevent them from dealing with it independently. The projector of that enterprise with all his faults was determined, and came forward boldly with his measures, but this Government did not seem to have the courage to propose anything definite.¹³⁶ Now, when further aid was demanded, the demand came on the Inspector General like a thunderbolt, and he was not yet so recovered from the shock as to be able to say what he intended to do. On this as on everything else, the Government had no policy but a negative policy.¹³⁷ [However,] action was necessary, but it was not such action as that purchased in the Cayley omnibus.¹³⁸ The Inspector General and his colleagues, by resting on their oars and hanging back, seemed anxious to get a little credit to themselves out of the unpopularity of the Grand Trunk at this juncture. (Hear, hear.) The Inspector General, if it could be done quietly, had no objection to getting a little credit at the expense of his predecessor. (Hear, hear.) He did not therefore announce any statesmanlike course to meet the exigencies of the case. Instead of this he had propounded a scheme, which had come to light, to the agent of the company — a scheme which had no basis of principle to rest upon, which was framed with a view to catching votes, and which capped the climax of the system which had made the ministry odious through the country.¹³⁹ The Government, however, would have acted more wisely by coming boldly out with their policy. Better have failed in doing so, than to have acted as they have done.¹⁴⁰ If the Grand Trunk required aid, it should have been granted, and if it was not right to give it, no aid should be appended, but the whole affair had been treated in a way which showed that it had been intended to make it subservient to the preservation of some doubtful votes.¹⁴¹ He should have much pleasure in voting for the motion in the possession of the chair.¹⁴²

MR. FELTON commenced by remarking upon the magnificent pretensions which the last speaker had put forward, and the very high tone of political morality he had assumed.¹⁴³ [He] thought the hon. gentleman ... had not illustrated by his example the principle he laid down. That hon. gentleman had stated that Ottawa was the place where above all others the Seat of Government should be placed, [but] had within a month voted¹⁴⁴ twice against Ottawa, and twice for Quebec¹⁴⁵! Several members from Lower

Canada had spoken, yet none had spoken a word in its favor. He was surprised that Lower Canadians could sit beside and become the most obsequious followers of men who never spoke without vilifying Lower Canada. He contradicted the statements of the hon. member for Lambton, in reference to the Lower Canada school laws. There were but a small proportion of the superior schools in Lower Canada, supported by the State. The appropriation from Government did not amount to more than four per cent of the amount actually contributed for education. He entered at length into an explanation of the school system of the Lower Province. Quebec was not the end of civilization, nor was Lower Canada poor. There were neither facts nor figures to prove either the one proposition or the other.¹⁴⁶ It was a common thing for the members of Haldimand and Lambton to represent Lower Canada as paying only £1 to £3 or £4 paid by Upper Canada, but how had these assertions been sustained, or had they even offered any reliable data, or indeed data at all in their support? none whatever. It was all broad unsupported assertion.¹⁴⁷ The Government had not failed to pass many good measures, notwithstanding the assertions to that effect from the opposition. The audit act was one that was generally assented to as a most excellent act, — and the Government are entitled to the fullest credit for it. The statements made from the opposition benches, were utterly unfounded.¹⁴⁸ The member for Lambton said that the Government had not passed a measure which gave complete satisfaction to any man in the house. He was very much inclined to agree with him there, and he did not think that under Responsible Government, any measure could be passed, which could give complete satisfaction to any one. Under that system there must be constant concessions and compromises. In reference to the Seigniorial Tenure, for example, there were many points in the Bill which he would have liked to see differently arranged, but he voted for them as a matter of compromise.¹⁴⁹ He proceeded to defend the Attorney General East for accepting a bill from the Legislative Council, on the Seigniorial Tenure question, different from that to which he had previously obtained the assent of the House. It would be impossible for any Government to make a ministerial question of the Seat of Government question. The hon. gentleman pointed out the discrepancies in opinion on the opposition benches upon the Grand Trunk scheme.¹⁵⁰ They had some members of the opposition who declared that to do anything for the Grand Trunk they would be aiding a gigantic swindle, while others cried out that what they proposed was not nearly enough.¹⁵¹ He alluded to the course which had led to defections in the ministerial ranks. The hon. member for Gray [sic] had left because the Government refused to accede to the demands of the Grand Trunk, and the members for Victoria and Northumberland had left because the Government would not saddle the Province with the municipal debts. He would like to know was the opposition prepared to assent to these demands.¹⁵² He thought the house had spent too much time on motions of want of confidence. He believed they had spent about half the session in discussing such motions, to the neglect of public business.¹⁵³ He saw nothing in the conduct of the Government to destroy his confidence in them, and would therefore vote against the motion.¹⁵⁴

MR. MERRITT would have preferred that this motion should not have been brought forward until they knew better what were the intentions of the Government.¹⁵⁵ [He] said that if ever any hon. member entertained a doubt as to the working of respo[n]sible Government that doubt must be solved by the conduct of the present administration. Since its advent to power they have witnessed nothing but scenes of recrimination. Night after night the time of the country was taken up with fruitless projects. Under the present system,¹⁵⁶ the Government had spent one-half their time in meeting the importunities of their supporters, and the other half in defending themselves from the attacks of the Opposition, so that they had no time to devote to maturing measures for promoting the great interests of the country¹⁵⁷. And such would always be the case under our present irresponsible government. So long as the government were not responsible to the people, so long would this mismanagement be perpetuated. Under the present system they were only responsible to that house for their seats — the people had no voice in their elevation to office — nor control over them except at their election. From the time of the Union, until 1849 the only policy of administrations, had been one of expediency, and it would be well for succeeding administrations had they looked back to that administration. If the financial policy then established, had been

still in operation, the country would not at this moment be involved in a debt of some £12,000,000. But that succeeding administration ... of 1852 set aside this policy; and what was the result?¹⁵⁸ [They] commenced a system of building railways, and contracting debts without providing the means of paying them. In three short years a debt was contracted of five millions of pounds¹⁵⁹ [and] from 1853 to 1855 — the Province was involved in a debt of £2,000,000 in one project the Gradd [sic] Trunk Railway.¹⁶⁰ The present Government had been blamed for not coming forward with a scheme to relieve the Grand Trunk. What right had they to bring forward any such scheme? Had the country not been assured by the Premier of the last Government, who forced the scheme through, that they would never be called upon to pay anything? He would not give them one farthing more. But he would vote to-morrow for any scheme that would put that road in a position for the shareholders themselves to finish it, and he would make the sacrifice of giving up the Government's preferential claim. The great scheme had proved to be a bubble.¹⁶¹ The only ground on which he would oppose the Government now was that they had lent themselves to the same things that had brought the country into its present financial difficulties. He would support them in the appropriation for Quebec, for they were not responsible for that, and he would aid them in resisting any further entanglement in the Grand Trunk scheme.¹⁶² The hon. gentleman slightly reviewed the acts of the present administration, and concluded by declaring his intention to vote against them on the vote of want of confidence.¹⁶³

MR. O'FARRELL denied the accusation that the price at which he, and certain other hon. gentlemen mentioned the other evening by the hon. member for Lambton, as being North Shore Railroad men, had supported the Government. He, for one, had never either advocated or condemned that project. He had listened to the arguments on both sides during the debate, and he came to that conclusion, to which every unbiassed member in that House should come to, that the Opposition had totally failed in establishing any reason why the government should not receive the confidence of that House.¹⁶⁴ The member for Lambton had narrowed the motion down to voting for or against going to Quebec, and had appealed to Upper Canada members to support the motion on that ground. He (Mr. O'Farrell) appealed to Lower Canada members whether they could support a motion placed on that ground. With reference to the charges of corruption against the Government, he considered that the Opposition had entirely failed to make out a case. He considered that the Commissioner of Crown Lands had completely cleared himself from the charges brought against him¹⁶⁵. The hon. gentleman then entered into a refutation of the charges advanced against the Board of Works, contending that the only charge against that body, which could be at all sustained, was that some of the contracts had not been open to public tender.¹⁶⁶ The Opposition should not object to the works on Lake Scugog, for they were undertaken at the instance and with the approbation of Mr. Langton, whom they had spoken of during the debate in such high terms. He defended the giving of contracts to Mr. Baby, and declared that they had been so given with perfect fairness to other contractors, and with benefit to the public.¹⁶⁷ The Government had also been accused of want of talent, but such a charge came with bad grace from the Opposition, one of whom, the hon. member for Lambton, with his ten years' Parliamentary experience, had failed twice in framing an amendment. With all the talking about the North Shore and Grand Trunk Railways, he would venture to assert, that if some day they came into power, they would be just as ready to give these projects even more aid than the present Government proposed.¹⁶⁸ He concluded by declaring his confidence in the Government, on the Seat of Government, as well as on the other questions that had come before the House.¹⁶⁹ He thought it would be a blessing to the country if the Opposition did not succeed in the motion before the house.¹⁷⁰

MR. FOLEY complimented the last speaker on his very lucid explanation of the management of the public works.¹⁷¹ No matter what might be the result of the motion now before the House, it was at least highly satisfactory to know they had a gentleman in that House — the member for Quebec [sic] — who was so well qualified for the post of Commissioner of Public Works. The hon. gentleman then proceeded

to say¹⁷² [that] unlike the members for Northumberland and Grey, [he] had no sins to confess, and no transgressions to atone for, in regard to any share he had in the formation of the present Government. From the very first, he found it impossible to support a Government conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, and he was glad to find that some who had given it their support at the outset, were now coming round to the position he had all along occupied. He did not consider that the term Coalition was applicable to the Government, even on their own ground. When the Postmaster General went back to his constituents, he claimed re-election on the ground that Sir Allan MacNab and his party had given up their own principles, and come over to his, come over to reform principles. He (Mr. Foley) had opposed the Government because he believed that the reverse was the case — that the Reform party was to be dominated over by Tory principles.¹⁷³ The fact was that ... the change had really taken place in the opinions of Mr. Spence and his friends, and that they had become conservative[s], instead of the conservatives having become reformers.¹⁷⁴ Every step they had since taken, every measure they had brought in, had gone to confirm that belief, for they had gone to consolidate the Tory party, and to rend asunder and destroy the Reform party. The effect of their Clergy Reserve Act was to build up dominant churches at the expense of the State. Their Militia, Police, and other Bills, all contained the element of Toryism, and were calculated to interfere with the liberties and free action of the people. The Government was defended for bringing down an appropriation for the construction of public buildings at Quebec, because the House had affirmed the principle of a permanent seat of Government. But last session, the house expressed an opinion in favour of the alternate system. Why did the Government not bring down an appropriation¹⁷⁵ for Toronto and Quebec¹⁷⁶, to carry out that vote of the house? (Hear, hear.) He was forced to the conclusion that the Government took this course, not because they desired to give effect to the will of the house, but because they desired to make political capital out of it, and to retain the votes of the members from the Quebec District. (Hear, hear.) It was the same policy as they had pursued in regard to the North Shore Railroad, and the Grand Trunk, the schemes for which, announced by the Government, were evidently intended for the simple purpose of conciliating their supporters.¹⁷⁷ The members for Northumberland and Victoria had been accused of having left the ministry because they would not give them what they required; but such was not the case, and there was not the least shadow of proof to show it, while they had Mr. Cayley's own proposition, offering to give a large bait to those gentlemen.¹⁷⁸ Again, what had been the conduct of the Government in reference to the North Shore Railway project? Was the scheme entered into for the benefit of the Province? No hon. gentleman would venture to make such an assertion after seeing those hon. gentlemen in favor of that project going into opposition before the Government could make up their minds on the project, and when the Government did finally come down with it, turning right round and stultifying themselves by voting for that very Government. And so with every other measure of the present Administration.¹⁷⁹ As had been remarked by the member for London, the members of the Administration, in the course they had given to the debate, seemed to have fancied that it was not the Administration who were on their trial, but the member for Lambton. The Inspector General, in reference to the Hincks' Committee, charged the member for Lambton with assuming the position of both judge and accuser. The charge was most unfounded, for it was well known that the member for Lambton had been placed on the Committee, in his absence, and much against his will. And the accusation came with a very bad grace from parties who had got into power by propagating the charges against Mr. Hincks through their presses, and from their places in the house,¹⁸⁰ for it is within the knowledge of every person that these hon. gentlemen hunted and persecuted, and drove that hon. gentleman from power, and then meanly took his place and declared that all the statements brought out by the corruption committee was, [sic] it was called, showed that the charges made against the Hon. Mr. Hincks were untrue.¹⁸¹ The Inspector General then and his colleagues might at least have been silent as to that matter. The Postmaster General now occupied a remarkable position. He had stated that he had joined the Government as a representative of the Reformers of Upper Canada, and that he would only continue a member of it, so long as he continued to enjoy the confidence of Reformers. Now what was the fact? Of the 19 Upper Canada Reformers who originally supported the Government, 12 had now forsaken them,

and of the remainder 3 were exceedingly shaky, only 4 remaining the thick and thin supporters of the Government.¹⁸² The position which the hon. gentleman occupies is therefore one unworthy of him, for he will find that the position taken by those who have deserted him is sustained by the constituencies they represent, and that even the plea held out that he went into that Government to carry out the views of the Reformers is no longer tenable. His position is therefore, at the present time, very humiliating, and he regretted that a gentleman who had been in his day a pillar in the Reform ranks should consent to occupy so degrading a position.¹⁸³ There was one remarkable feature in the position taken by the Government. As regarded any measures of the late administration, which could gain them any popularity, they were very glad to take every credit for it. But when they were accused of any corrupt conduct or malpractices in the several departments — “Oh,” they said, “they are the result of the system left us as a legacy by our predecessors, which we have not had time to reform.” He was surprised how those members of the Government, who were members of the late administration, could quietly sit still, while the Inspector General and others of their colleagues threw all their sins over on the shoulders of their predecessors, some of whom were their present colleagues.¹⁸⁴ It was the business of those gentlemen to stand up and defend their former colleagues, for in doing so they would simply be defending themselves and absent friends.¹⁸⁵ Of all the speeches damaging to the Government delivered during this debate, the most damaging was that of the Crown Lands Commissioner. It appeared there was an item of £10,000 not accounted for. And the Commissioner of Crown Lands¹⁸⁶ had brought down letters from the accountant in his own office, for the purpose of defending his own Department, and in doing so, he would admit that the hon. Commissioner had done that which is manly and correct — but in doing so, he had made a direct attack on another department, and had shown that the Auditor General was guilty of gross remissness in not examining the vouchers when the Auditor General reported a defalcation of £10,000 in the Crown Lands Department. And it was said that the Auditor General — and he believes that it was said with truth — that he had not audited the accounts of the Postmaster General; and if that were true of two departments, why might it not be true of the Board of Works Report, or any other? But it went further than that. It went far to prove that there is a want of harmony among the departments; that there is no accountability anywhere. He does not mean to accept the charges against the Auditor General as correct; but he would say, that the fact of the Auditor General’s going before the Committee of Public Accounts, and confidently stating that there are defalcations in the Departments, when it is triumphantly shown by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that he had not received the accounts of that department, before he appeared before that committee, made a strong *prima facie* case against that officer¹⁸⁷, and he (Mr. Foley) was not the man to blame the Commissioner of Crown Lands, until further evidence was produced. It had been denied by the hon. member for Lotbiniere that the Government had made no offers to their supporters, in order to retain their confidence, while at the same moment¹⁸⁸ the member for Wolfe, who appears on many occasions as the mouthpiece of the Government, intimated that the reason why certain members withdrew their support from the Administration, and went over to the Opposition benches, was, that unworthy propositions were made by them to the Government, and that when they were rejected, those hon. gentlemen, out of ill feeling, withdrew¹⁸⁹. Did not this prove the whole case charged against the Government, that they kept in existence by yielding to discreditable and grasping proposals on the part of their supporters? It was only in this way that such a coalition as the present could exist, supported as it was by a number of little cliques, each having views and interests, and schemes of its own.¹⁹⁰ They, in reality, are accurately described in Lord John Russell’s history of the Walpole Administration.¹⁹¹ The hon. gentleman here referred to the destructive principles of the hon. member for Lambton, who, he contended, seemed to be on his trial. The principles with which that hon. member was most closely associated were what are called sectarian principles. How then could the Ministry object to the member for Lambton when they themselves had brought forward a more extreme ecclesiastical measure than the hon. member for Lambton could have hoped to have carried¹⁹² — such a measure as they would have considered most objectionable two years ago, but which they have now been forced into by the strength of public feeling. — Honorable members in the ministerial ranks throw slime on the member for Lambton, though

the feelings of those members are necessarily more in unison with him than with those of members of the administration.¹⁹³ On the Separate School question, were not the views of the great majority of Upper Canada members on the other side, in union with those of the member for Lambton? And so it was on other questions. And why should abuse be heaped on the member for Lambton, for advocating a few years in advance, principles which were now held by the whole Reformers of Upper Canada? He believed there was not one question which the member for Lambton had taken up with energy and vigour, not one of the questions that formed the distinctive features of the member for Lambton's policy, which honorable gentlemen opposite would not be found to sustain, in principle at least.¹⁹⁴ As to the effects of the present vote, some of the reasons given by gentlemen why the ministry should be supported are very unique. Some of them say that an adverse vote will endanger private measures now before the House. One honorable gentleman wants to get a concession line opened; another wants to incorporate a bank; another wants to borrow a sum of money from the consolidated municipal loan fund for the benefit of his constituents, and so on. These are the reasons given by some honorable gentlemen to palliate the vote they mean to give. Now, he must say, that such a mode of reasoning as that is most absurd. It is not to be supposed that the ministry will endanger private measures because they may not have the confidence of the House, and he would do the ministry the justice to say, that they have shewn no such inclination.¹⁹⁵ Whatever might be the result of the vote on the motion before the house, he hoped it would be taken in its simple merits — whether they did or not deserve and possess the confidence of the house¹⁹⁶, and without any regard to a little log-rolling that honorable members may have to do.¹⁹⁷

MR. C. DAOUST asked why the supporters of the Administration were so mute in this Debate? Had they nothing to say on the behalf of the Government whom they supported?¹⁹⁸ As to the settlement of the Seat of Government, it had been tried to connect this matter with the vote of want of confidence, but the one thing had no relation to the other. He was in favor of the decision for Quebec, as pronounced by the House, but as to confidence in the ministry, it was known he had never expressed any, and he had not changed his opinion. The motion before the house was to the effect that the policy of the Government on the Seat of Government, and other great questions, had not been such as to command the confidence of the House. They should have made the Seat of Government a ministerial question, and the opposition would not have been under the painful necessity of proposing a vote of want of confidence.¹⁹⁹

Ironical cheers from the ministerial benches.²⁰⁰

[MR. C. DAOUST continued:] The Government should have selected a site and made a stand upon it. But supposing the motion carried, would Lower Canada interests be necessarily sacrificed? He did not see why they should. He thought that in the Cabinet that might be formed, Lower Canada should have as good opportunities of exercising influence as it had now. The members for Quebec who support the Government, had seen nothing but Quebec in the whole Province, and had refused last session to vote for a permanent seat for fear of prejudicing their chances. Well they had gained a vote for Quebec.²⁰¹

A Voice. — But the Government is not there yet.²⁰²

MR. C. DAOUST. — No, it was not yet, and if it went there it would be a cause of continual agitation, and would probably lead to a dissolution of the Union, for in that case Upper Canada would commence a strong agitation for it.²⁰³

Several Voices. — "We have no objection."²⁰⁴

MR. C. DAOUST. — He himself had no objection to a dissolution, but connected with that there were grave difficulties and sources of strife and confusion with Upper Canada. He could not see how the supporters of the Ministry, who were so strong for the Union, could anticipate such a contingency

with satisfaction. The motion before the House was not so closely allied to permanency as to involve the contradiction spoken of. The vote for Quebec did not necessarily bind the House to keep the Ministry in their places, if they forfeited the confidence of the House in relation to other measures. The decision had been made an open question, and did not bind the House to employ the present Ministry in carrying out its vote. Supposing the Northern Railway, as an open question, had received the approbation of the House, would the House therefore be bound to keep the Ministers in office until the road was built? The thing was evidently unreasonable. The member for Soulanges had proposed to make the Seat of Government a Ministerial question, and in that respect he had agreed with the Opposition, and would of course go with them when the vote was taken. The silence of the Lower Canadians on the other side, had rendered a poor service to the Ministry, for if they had spoken they might have influenced several votes which would possibly have turned the balance. Upon small questions the Attorney General East had refused to allow a trifling amendment, with the threat that he would abandon the bill.²⁰⁵

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND. — There never had been such a question before the House.²⁰⁶

MR. C. DAOUST. — Well then, he would propose his amendment when the bill came up for a third reading, and as it was not a Ministerial one, he would expect the assistance of his Lower Canada friends. A Coalition Government had need of much intrigue to keep itself in office, and he knew of one such at present which was by spreading through the Counties in Lower Canada, that to get any help people must support the Government. Such was at present the feeling in his County. It was said by his constituents, that if he had supported the Government, certain improvements which had been refused, would not have met with that fate. These small things served sometimes as better indications of the character of a Government, than, broader measures. — The Government employed agents in disseminating these sentiments. The Provincial Secretary had lent himself to these intrigues.²⁰⁷

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER said there was no truth in these reports, and challenged him to mention the names of his informants.²⁰⁸

MR. PAPIN asked whether the Provincial Secretary would be allowed to use such language?²⁰⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the member for Beauharnois had not complained, and it was for him to do it.²¹⁰

MR. C. DAOUST made no such complaint. He then went on to show, that the means which he said had been used, and which he could prove, were unworthy of any Ministry, and calculated to demoralize the constituen[c]ies. The means had prevailed, but he had been refused demands which he had made for his County, which demands ought to have been granted. He had too much confidence, however, in the good sense of his electors, to believe they could be influenced against him by such means, for he had already exposed them, and would expose them again.²¹¹

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH objected that the hon. gentleman had already spoken forty minutes.²¹²

Cries of "go on," "go on," from the Ministerial Benches²¹³.

MR. C. DAOUST ... went on to comment on the various measures, which the Government had introduced, affecting Lower Canada.²¹⁴ [He spoke of] the act of promoting higher education in Lower Canada, which he asserted had disappointed the country. The funds to be placed in the hands of the Superintendent of Education were funds already in existence. £5,000 would be taken from the Consolidated Revenues of the country, and the rest from the Jesuits' Estates. The only new feature in the bill was the diminution of the Common School fund by £7,500, for which the framer of that measure would

find he had suffered very much in the opinion of the people of Lower Canada. If the motion carried against Quebec, he thought the Province generally would not be greatly chagrined.²¹⁵

MR. TURCOTTE. — The hon. gentlemen of the opposition, fearing to propose a direct vote of want of confidence, had mixed it up with the Seat of Government question at Quebec, in order to catch a few Upper Canada votes. The member for Beauharnois had asked whether, because an open question had been decided, the Ministry then in power were to be kept in office until the work[s], for instance the Railway from Quebec to Huron, were built. Most assuredly he would not, but that was nothing analogous to the question in hand. Mr. Turcotte then went into the said Railway matter, and regretted that Mr. Brown was not there to hear what he had to say. It was a great provincial measure, and he was prepared to press any Government on the subject. As to the motion before the House to oust the Government on the Seat of Government question, it was essentially *un propos de bottes*. The men who had voted for Quebec now blamed the administration for not putting £300,000 in the estimates for Public Buildings, when all that was necessary to be expended this year was £50,000. He ridiculed the frivolous propositions for votes of want of confidence with the certainty that they would be lost. If a government could be formed without coalition, he would promise them his vote. He then went on minutely to show the utter impracticability of forming any government at all on which parties of the most opposite principles would not be found. How would his friends (the Rouges) coalesce with the member for Lambton? The member for Soulanges had been invited to vote against the ministry because he had proposed a vote of want of confidence in them recently, but what was the ground of this motion? It was because the government should have agreed upon permanency, and had failed to do so. It was clear they could agree upon a general principle, but that was very different from the fixation of the site. If his friends assisted the more *rouge* political men who were now assailing the ministry they would live to repent it. He hoped they would not so commit themselves, and he trusted he had spoken his sentiments to them very temperately.²¹⁶

MR. LABERGE regretted to be obliged to rise at this late hour, and would prefer adjourning. — The proposition of the member for Montreal was one of want of confidence in the Ministry for their general conduct, including that in relation to the Seat of Government. There was not a member who had spoken who had not said that they had no sympathies in the government, but based their support upon the necessity of carrying on the government.²¹⁷ This was the opinion of all the Reformers of Lower Canada, and none of them were prepared to say that he had full confidence in the administration. An administration which only sought to keep itself in office, as the present one did, could not last and would not. An attempt had been made to shew that the Lower Canada members on this side of the house acted now in opposition to their former votes. They had voted for Quebec; he and the hon. member for L'Assomption had formed the majority. They had renounced all hopes in favour of Montreal, but was that any reason why they should refuse to vote conscientiously upon the motion now before the house, which expressed a want of confidence in the administration. The question of permanency of the seat of government had been determined, and no administration should ignore that decision or take the responsibility of rescinding it. He was prepared, under any circumstances, to repeat his vote for Quebec, and also to grant the funds necessary to build them [sic]; but under no circumstances would he be induced to consent to keep the present ministry in office. The defeat of the administration on the subject of the Speakership had been considered an important vote; but what was the appointment of a Speaker, who had vacated office every new Parliament, compared with that of finding a permanent place for the archives of the country. The latter was a subject of greater importance than the former²¹⁸. We were now begging over all the world to make up for losses consequent upon the moving system, and he contended the Government which made so much of a Speakership²¹⁹ ought to have been prepared to come down and take the responsibility of a measure for the permanent seat of government to be located at a fixed place. The vote of £50,000 for the erection of parliament buildings would not extinguish the prospect of future

agitation taking place.²²⁰ It was a mere juggling trick, got up by those who were opposed to Quebec; a mere back door to get out of a difficulty. What was £50,000 when lands were voted by millions, and money by millions also, for railways and other such extravagant purposes?²²¹ Did they expect to ensure the permanency of the Parliament at Quebec by any paltry vote of £50,000 for the erection of their buildings?²²² If they did, they would be most miserably disappointed. The motion before the House was confidence, or want of confidence. [He referred to] the anarchical state in which the administration was now found, one department being at strife with the other, and their heads frequently speaking to each other, as the Opposition had never presumed to do. Their supporters were leaving them one by one, and now we are told that it was because they asked what could not be given them, but this only proved that the administration was only sustained by such means as paying for support. As in the past, so it would be in the future. He did not say that all the members supporting the Government were equally hungry, for he knew them to be highly honorable men; but if they had no personal favors to solicit, they were interested in public enterprises, and their support was based upon the favor the Government accorded to these projects. Without entering upon the merits of their different enterprises, either of the Grand Trunk or the little trunks, he is convinced that that is the secret of their support of the administration. The administration itself is a coalition, without any definite principle; but simply guided by the idea that its politics are railways, and it is not wonderful that every member who has some pet little railroad project to conduct should adhere to an administration recognizing this line of policy. But it may turn that railway politics are not the best adapted to the interests of the country. We have seen the strange spectacle since this government has been formed of a government, which has the respect of no one, and whose fall is ardently desired by many, which yet exists in spite of all. The effect of this coalition is an immense demoralization in the country. It has destroyed all respect for principle in political men. The contagious effects of the coalition are such that even the Opposition is affected. It is the Tories who have the control of the country. The Prime Minister is the very embodiment of Toryism — in Lower Canada if any person wishes to know what Toryism is, the answer is immediately “Sir Allan MacNab.” That idea is not confined to any one part of the Province, but is general throughout the whole of Lower Canada, among the inhabitants of the cities, and labourers in the fields. Gentlemen who have hitherto declared that it was necessary to crush Toryism, who subsequently declared that Toryism did not exist were, at length found, under the evil influence of this coalition, to surrender all their principles and enter an administration, of which the head is the personification of Toryism. It is not from such a Government as this that we can expect a strong and wide direction of the affairs of this country. They are not capable of forming such a plan for the relief of the country, because they have not the courage to undertake the task. They have struggled each individually against the member for Lambton — a man without a party — a man whose political principles are not adopted by any one in full. They have struggled against the member for Toronto, a man also without a party — a man who has no avowed, no political course since the commencement of this session, and had been compelled to lower their flag before that hon. gentleman. They have indulged in personal combats, and read long extracts from newspapers on one side and on the other, and that is all. They announced at the beginning of the session a measure of extreme importance — the Police Bill. They made a great noise about it in the speech from the throne. The Premier introduced it. It was stated to be a measure of such great importance, that its provisions must be extended to the whole country; but certain members objected to its application to the rural parts, and the Ministry, with the utmost complaisance, withdrew all that part of the Bill which refers to the rural parts; then the cities declared against it, and here we are at the close of the session without being able to discover what has become of this important measure! The Administration is always on the point of expiring; and that proves that it has no strength, no vitality, no command over the House. Day by day desertions take place, and there is no doubt that, if the session should be prolonged for fifteen days longer, the whole of the North Shore Railroad men may be seen, without spectacles, defiling from the Ministerial ranks to those of the Opposition. The Ministry will occupy the places of the Opposition, and the Opposition will take the places of the Ministry, and, perhaps, the knowledge of that fact will have its effect in inducing many of the ministerialists to get

on what must speedily be the strongest side. Every one of any eminence in the House, whether in the administration or in the opposition, has his newspaper organ, yet the whole newspaper press of Canada is now in opposition, even the former organs of Ministers; even the organ of the Premier, all have abandoned them; and as the press is undoubtedly the expression of public opinion; and as that fact proves that the whole force of public opinion is against them, how is it possible that this administration can sustain itself? Every day it is seen in mortal agonies, every day it is on the point of expiring, and it is only kept up by the merest [of] chances.²²³ In view of such a state of things, how could they command the confidence of the house? The Administration would wake up after a time, and find that they had been under the influence of a most distressing night-mare. (Laughter.) He thought that the ministry would have a majority, but that there would not be one single hon. member forming that majority, who had not given a vote of want of confidence against the present Administration this session, on some one or other measure, some upon the question of the North Shore Railroad from Montreal to Quebec, others on the Grand Trunk Railroad between Three Rivers and Arthabaska; and if all those hon. gentlemen were now to retire from their present seats, the ministerial benches would be left comparatively empty, and the Administration would be forced from their weak position to resign. The hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands occupied his present seat in spite of the wishes of the people of the country, his supporters, and almost himself. In fact, the hon. gentleman was evidently surprised at viewing himself so positioned. He had been well hooted over the country before he took his seat, and since. He had no followers previous to his taking the office nor subsequently, and in himself, he was a type of what the coalition was in itself. (Cheers.)²²⁴ Only a few days since he was menaced by the whole band of Northern road men, and, if it had not been for the resistance of the Opposition to their projects on that occasion, they would have made an end of the Administration.²²⁵ The Administration owed their present position to that taken all along by the Opposition, who did not want to extinguish them too suddenly and pronounce their "sudden death," but wished to act magnanimously. (Hear, hear.)²²⁶ Not wishing to detain the House longer, he would say that the vote he was about to give will justify itself perfectly. It will not contradict his vote in favor of permanence; but, while satisfied of this, he would give his vote in favor of the fall of the Administration, which has nothing to recommend it.²²⁷

MR. MURNEY, at half-past one, A.M., moved an adjournment. He said that such an extensive range had been given to the debate that it was impossible to continue it at that late hour of the night.²²⁸ The hon. members opposite, from their present appearance, (hear, hear,) would be thought to be sleeping on beds of roses; but he trusted that they would before to-morrow night, instead of enjoying such comfortable repose on soft benches, find themselves sleeping upon thorny couches. (Laughter.)²²⁹

MR. HOLTON supported the motion. On Friday night some of the members from Lower Canada had desired an opportunity of defending themselves from the attacks which they said had been made on them; and as those hon. members had not yet taken the floor they might still have an opportunity of doing so.²³⁰

MR. POWELL drew a different conclusion from the premises stated by the member for Montreal; the conclusion he arrived at was, that those hon. members were so alarmed by the full knowledge of their sins, that they dare not shirk.²³¹ [OR] The hon. members of the Administration evidently were impressed with their weakness of position, and that was illustrated by their disinclination to enter into the debate, and he therefore hoped a vote would now be taken.²³²

MR. DUFRESNE expressed his obligations to the member for Montreal for the willingness he had exhibited to give him an opportunity of speaking; but if he had entertained the idea it was relinquished, and he thought it would perhaps be as well for the member for Montreal not to press him to speak, for which he might have said something against the administration a day or two since, he had been induced

to change his mind as the debate went on, and if he did speak, might perhaps say something in their favour.²³³ He would prefer to have the vote taken.²³⁴

MR. PAPIN was in favor of adjournment. It was now late, and hon. members would all desire to express themselves fully on the motion.²³⁵

CAPT. RHODES said, that the real reason why this motion of adjournment was made was, that the members for Victoria and Northumberland are now absent, and there is a desire on the part of the Opposition to obtain their presence. After the very extraordinary conduct of those members this session, he felt very much disinclined to hold out to them any favours of this nature²³⁶, and he was prepared to sit up all night. (Hear, hear.)²³⁷

MR. MURNEY thought it very unfair for the hon. member to say this. The Attorney General West had sat in his seat listening to all the arguments that had been addressed, and although he stated in the commencement that the administration were upon their trial, he had not taken any means to contradict statements brought against them or otherwise. He (Mr. Murney) only wished for an adjournment on account of the hon. members opposite who were mostly asleep, and the country should understand why it took place. (Hear, hear.)²³⁸

MR. CONGER thought the question had been trifled with long enough already. He was opposed to the adjournment.²³⁹

MR. SCATCHERD said there were a great many members who wished to speak yet. He wished to speak. (Go on!) He would go on, when he was ready. If the adjournment was not agreed to he would suggest that they should at least adjourn for a quarter of an hour, till two o'clock.²⁴⁰

MR. A. DORION supported the adjournment. On Friday night the Administration sought an adjournment, knowing that there would be an Upper Canada majority of seven or eight votes against them. To-night, they had brought up all their votes, and knowing that two members of the Opposition had not arrived, because there was no boat to bring them, they now pressed a vote.²⁴¹

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH denied that the adjournment was moved on Friday at the instance of the Government. The Government did not seek it, but were prepared then as now to take a vote. He desired to have the matter settled to-night. As one of the gentlemen referred to was going to Europe, they might as well propose an adjournment till he came back.²⁴²

MR. MACKENZIE thought it was a capital suggestion that they should adjourn till the gentleman came back from Europe. It would prevent their doing a great deal of mischief. (Laughter.) In a multitude of counsellors there was safety, and he would like to hear a few more members deliver themselves of their sentiments — especially the Lower Canadian members. He appealed to the member for Toronto, whether, at two o'clock in the morning, a man was not entitled to claim to go to his bed?²⁴³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the Government being on their trial, left the matter of adjournment in the hands of the house.²⁴⁴

MR. BROWN said there were members of the Opposition who, from sickness, were unable to be here at this hour of the time, and others from a distance who were expected to arrive in a few hours. And the Opposition would take care that there should not be a division till those gentlemen were here.²⁴⁵

MR. FOLEY said the Government must be driven to very hard straits, if they took such means as this to prevent the presence of four or five members at a vote, which was either life or death to them. It would place the Government in a very odious light in the face of the country.²⁴⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD asked if there had ever been such a statement made by any party in the House of Commons, that they would continue to sit and to speak until certain gentlemen, who might have taken upon themselves the responsibility of absenting themselves, might be present?²⁴⁷

MR. HARTMAN thought it was no more unconstitutional for members to express that intention, than for others to intimate as plainly as actions could, that they would endeavour to force a vote to-night, to prevent those gentlemen being present at the vote.²⁴⁸

The motion for an adjournment was lost²⁴⁹.

(533)

And the Question being again proposed on the Amendment to the proposed Amendment to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply);

Mr. Murney moved, seconded by Mr. Rankin, and the Question being put, That this House do now adjourn; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Brown, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Patrick, Rankin, Rolph, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright. — (35.)

(533-534)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Bureau, Burton, Casault, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Evanturel, Fellowes, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lumsden, Macbeth, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Roblin, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Stevenson, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding. — (58.)

So it passed in the Negative.

The debate was then continued²⁵⁰.

At a quarter past three, on motion of DR. McDONALD²⁵¹,

The house adjourned for half an hour.²⁵²

About a quarter to four the debate was again resumed²⁵³.

The Opposition continued to move motion after motion for an adjournment of the Debate.²⁵⁴

[The motions were] resisted by the supporters of the Administration, the members of the Government not themselves voting.²⁵⁵

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD and MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE argued that the Government had always been ready to take the vote at any time, or to adjourn the debate, as the House might think proper.²⁵⁶

MR. DORION ... [spoke] to the main motion.²⁵⁷

At seven o'clock, MR. MACBETH moved the adjournment of the Debate for five weeks.²⁵⁸

MR. CRAWFORD ... seconded the motion.²⁵⁹

MR. BROWN made ... a humorous and sarcastic speech against the ... revolutionary character of the motion²⁶⁰.

[MR. MACBETH] asked leave to withdraw it, ... as it was found, upon discussion, that the effect of this motion would be to stop the supplies altogether²⁶¹.

Objection being made it could not be withdrawn²⁶².

After a long discussion which lasted till half-past nine, a motion for adjournment till 12 o'clock was put and lost.²⁶³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY proposed that, if the Opposition would allow Mr. Macbeth's motion to be either withdrawn or voted upon, the Government would agree to an adjournment till 11 o'clock.²⁶⁴

This was objected to, and the Debate went on as before.²⁶⁵

Shortly before eleven, another vote was taken on a motion for adjournment, which was also lost, and the Debate continued²⁶⁶.

(534) | And the House having continued to sit till after Twelve of the clock on Tuesday morning;

TUESDAY, 20 MAY 1856

(534) | And the Question being again proposed on the Amendment to the proposed Amendment to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply);

Mr. *Chisholm* moved, seconded by Mr. *Angus Morrison*, and the Question being put, That this House do now adjourn; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins*, *Brown*, *Bureau*, *Chisholm*, *Christie*, *Conger*, *Charles Daoust*, *Darche*, *Jean B.E. Dorion*, *Antoine A. Dorion*, *Evanturel*, *Ferres*, *Foley*, *Frazer*, *Hartman*, *Holton*, *Jackson*, *Laberge*, *Mackenzie*, *Matheson*, *Mattice*, *Angus Morrison*, *Murney*, *Papin*, *Patrick*, *Sanborn*, *Scatcherd*, *Stevenson*, *Valois*, *Wilson*, and *Wright*. — (31.)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Bellingham*, *Bourassa*, *Bowes*, *Brodeur*, *Burton*, *Casault*, *Chabot*, *Chapais*, *Clarke*, *Crawford*, *Daly*, *Desaulniers*, *Dionne*, *Dostaler*, *Dufresne*, *Fellowes*, *Felton*, *Thomas Fortier*, *Octave C. Fortier*, *Fournier*, *Gill*, *Guévremont*, *Labelle*, *Laporte*, *Larwill*, *LeBoutillier*, *Macbeth*, *McCann*, *Marchildon*, *Masson*, *Meagher*, *O'Farrell*, *Polette*, *Pouliot*, *Powell*, *Rhodes*, *Roblin*, *Shaw*, *Solicitor General Smith*, *Taché*, *Terrill*, *Thibaudeau*, *Turcotte*, *Whitney*, and *Yeilding*. — (45.)

So it passed in the Negative.

Mr. Galt moved, seconded by Mr. Foley, and the Question being put, That this House do now adjourn; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Fellowes, Foley, Frazer, Galt, Hartman, Jackson, Jobin, Laberge, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Matheson, Mattice, Murney, Papin, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, and Wright. — (26.)

(535)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Casault, Chabot, Chapais, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Macbeth, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rhodes, Roblin, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Stevenson, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding. — (50.)

So it passed in the Negative.

Mr. Foley moved, seconded by Mr. Galt, and the Question being put, That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair until Twelve o'clock this day; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Brown, Christie, Charles Daoust, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Galt, Hartman, Jackson, Jobin, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Patrick, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright. — (24.)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bourassa, Brodeur, Burton, Casault, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Fellowes, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Macbeth, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rhodes, Roblin, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Stevenson, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding. — (50.)

So it passed in the Negative.

Mr. Murney moved, seconded by Mr. Foley, and the Question being put, That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair until Twelve o'clock this day; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Brown, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, DeWitt, Antoine A. Dorion, Frazer, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright. — (23.)

(536)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Bureau, Burton, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Conger, Cook, Crysler, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Fellowes, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Murney, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Spence, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding. — (56.)

So it passed in the Negative.

Mr. Holton moved, seconded by Mr. Scatcherd, and the Question being put, That this House do now adjourn; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Brown, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Roderick McDonald,

Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Patrick, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright. — (27.)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Bell, Bellingham, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Polette, Poulin, Price, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Spence, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding.* — (55.)

So it passed in the Negative.

Mr. *Murney* moved, seconded by Mr. *Mackenzie*, and the Question being put, That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for one hour; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

(536-537)

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Brown, Bureau, Charles Daoust, Darche, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Laberge, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright.* — (26.)

(537)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Crysler, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding.* — (62.)

So it passed in the Negative.

Mr. *Holton* moved, seconded by Mr. *Aikins*, and the Question being put, That this House do now adjourn; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jobin, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Murney, Papin, Patrick, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright.* — (26.)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Bell, Bellingham, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Whitney.* — (61.)

So it passed in the Negative.

[At] twelve o'clock, ... MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair for an hour, without receiving any instructions from the House.²⁶⁷

At half-past one, MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER resumed the chair²⁶⁸.

The debate was then resumed upon the main motion.²⁶⁹

MR. RANKIN said that, now that the distinguished European stranger (Mr. S. Smith,) for whom they had been waiting so long, had arrived, he hoped that all obstacles to their coming to a vote were removed. (Laughter.)²⁷⁰

MR. ROBINSON said that, when this distinguished individual went away again, he hoped he would take rope enough to hang himself politically. (Laughter.)²⁷¹

MR. MURNEY attacked the Attorney General West for the inconsistency he had shown in taking office with his present colleagues, and swallowing wholesale his former profession on the Clergy Reserve question, on the Elective Council, and on the Independence of Parliament bill.²⁷² He thought the Attorney General should consider it due to himself to reply to the numerous attacks which had been made upon him in the course of the debate.²⁷³

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said, that the member for Hastings had given in his adhesion to the present Government.²⁷⁴

MR. MURNEY. — That is incorrect.²⁷⁵

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH contended that he had both voted and spoken in favor of the Government, and gave them his confidence.²⁷⁶

MR. MURNEY denied that this was so.²⁷⁷

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH repeated the statement,²⁷⁸ [and] attacked ... the position and consistency of the member for Hastings²⁷⁹. [He] went on to speak generally in support of the course pursued by the administration. With regard to the members for Victoria and Northumberland, he said that he did not think that if there had been a vote on the estimate[s] for £10,000 to Port Hope harbour these members would have been so ready to desert the Government.²⁸⁰ He blamed the Opposition for having wasted more time this session in useless discussions on motions of want of confidence, than the Government had spent in carrying their motions. He thanked the gentlemen from Lower Canada for the loyal support they had all along given to the Administration.²⁸¹

MR. S. SMITH said that since he had left the house on Friday night, until this morning, he had had an opportunity of seeing his constituents, both Conservatives and Reformers, and some whose faith is bound up in the Attorney General West, and he had not met one man who had not said to him, "You must not leave the country now, you must go back, show your colours, and give one vote against the administration to put them out of office."²⁸² (Hear, hear.)²⁸³ He might perhaps be taunted with having lost the confidence of his constituents by the course he had pursued, but he would reply that if he had lost their confidence it was by supporting the present administration; and by a consistent course of opposition to men who have sacrificed their country for place, power and patronage, he may perhaps regain their confidence.²⁸⁴ It was a small matter whether he should be returned again to this house or not, but it was a matter of great consequence, whether or not Upper Canada should be placed under the domination of Lower Canada, by the Seat of Government being taken to Quebec. By taking that course, the Government had forfeited his confidence. In regard to the Port Hope Harbour he challenged the Solicitor General West and the members of the Administration, to assert that they ever had any communication direct or indirect with him, on the subject of the Port Hope Harbour. If they asked the people of Port Hope they would find that his sympathies were always with Cobourg rather than Port Hope. But, had there been any communications with the member for East Durham (Mr. Burton) whom he now saw sitting in his (Mr. Smith's) former seat, and who, it was understood, was to vote with the Government, although he had frequently expressed himself as having no confidence in them. (Hear, hear.)²⁸⁵

MR. J. SMITH said he did not consider it becoming in the Government to charge hon. members with sinister motives in the course they took on this question. It had been insinuated that he had forsaken the Government, because the appropriation to the Port Hope Harbour in the estimates of last year, was not in the estimates of this year. This was not the case. If he had been successful, with the assistance of other hon. members, in getting an appropriation for the Port Hope Harbour, he was glad of it. But it was a most unworthy subterfuge for the Government to avail themselves of, in meeting a motion of want of confidence.... He had not, like the member for West Northumberland, had the pleasure of visiting his constituents within the last few days, but he had been among the constituents of the member for East Durham (Mr. Burton), and had met with a good many of that gentleman's friends and opponents, and he had heard but one opinion as to this motion, which was unequivocally this, that the Government had lost the confidence of the country. (Hear, hear.)²⁸⁶ No one knew better than the members of the administration, and he would not particularize further than by saying that no one knew better than the Postmaster General, that the administration had not the confidence of those members by whom it had been supported. No one knew it better than the member for Niagara. How often had that hon. gentleman met the Reform supporters of the administration, and been promised redress? How often had they been met in caucus, and had matters brought before them, so as to hold out the hope that the Ministry would be put in a different shape, so as to be a little more satisfactory to the public wish? Yet no such attempt had been made, nor does he believe that it will be made. He would therefore give the Attorney General West a hint now, which he had always refused to take hitherto, for he had said that he obtained his commission on the floor of this House; and it is only here that he will take his dismissal. That, perhaps, is the constitutional and proper mode; but he would inform the Attorney General West, that the public of this Province thought the Administration might be much better shaped if he were not in it.²⁸⁷ Mr. Smith then alluded to some of the measures of the Government, and stated that if he had been in the house recently, when Mr. Brown submitted his motion for taking a Census with a view to the adjustment of representation, he would have voted for the motion, in opposition to the Government. For the amendments introduced into the Ecclesiastical Corporations Bill, he thought the Government were entitled to little credit. He considered on the contrary that they deserved great censure for having designedly omitted those clauses, in copying their Bill from the Vermont Act, and in only inserting those clauses when forced upon them. The hon. member also referred to the tug boat contract, and to the recklessness of the Postmaster General in increasing the deficiency in his department, by establishing new offices where they were not wanted. He knew of cases in which the Postmaster General had established offices where the people did not want them, did not wish to be troubled with them.²⁸⁸

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE denied the correctness of this statement.²⁸⁹

[MR. J. SMITH continued:] Beyond a certain limit forbearance ceases to be a virtue, and when Quebec was determined on as the future and permanent Seat of Government, he felt that it was the last feather that broke the camel's back, and he could no longer support an Administration which would endanger the safety of the Union.²⁹⁰

MR. BURTON, in reply to the remarks by the members for Northumberland and Victoria, said it was very unfair to place on his shoulders the burden of the £10,000 grant to the Port Hope Harbour. He had assisted in getting it, but the best proof that he was not bought by it, was the circumstance that he still supported the Government, although there was no such vote this year. There was no administration or man in Canada capable of buying him. He would support the Government in the present occasion, because he considered it an improper time to bring forward a vote of want of confidence, just at the winding up of the session. (Laughter.) But there were other measures to come up afterwards, on which he did not promise his adhesion to the Government. (Hear, hear.) On the very matter out of which this had arisen, the grant for the Houses of Parliament in Quebec, he should vote against the Government.

(Hear, hear.)²⁹¹ He then called on Mr. [S.] Smith at once to retract the charges against him, or to prove them.²⁹²

MR. S. SMITH retracted everything that he had said against the member for Durham.²⁹³

CAPT. RHODES attacked the members for Northumberland and Victoria, and repeated the statements which had been previously made about the Port Hope harbour.²⁹⁴ The speech of Mr. Sydney Smith, announcing his change of views, had not elevated him much in his opinion, or in the confidence of members of this House. He certainly is not inclined to put any faith in the purity of principle of that member or of his brother. They abandoned the Government just at the time the estimates came down, and shirked the vote on Friday night. They, he believed, are styled honorable and learned members, which, as he understood it, means that they are not engaged in trade, yet he had often heard that those gentlemen were in the market, and some singular facts which had come to his knowledge, had conveyed to him very singular ideas of the kind of market in which they were for sale.²⁹⁵ As for himself, he did not wish to be considered a very ardent supporter of the present administration. (Hear, hear.) He did not object to their principles or measures, but he objected to the spirit of procrastination they displayed, and their habit of avoiding a case when it was presented before them.²⁹⁶

MR. SCATCHERD said there was nothing he liked worse than the position of such members as the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, who would neither thoroughly support the government, nor thoroughly oppose them. For himself, he had not lost his confidence in the present Government, for he never had any.²⁹⁷ A Coalition Government is not fitted for this great and growing country.²⁹⁸ It was a Government which existed by giving pickings to its friends; it was sustained by patronage, and by patronage alone. It had commenced operations on borrowed capital, and, the whole of that being now expended, there was no alternative for it but to explode.²⁹⁹ Consequently, [he] could vote for the motion with pleasure.³⁰⁰

DR. CHURCH said that when he arrived in Quebec he found the Reform party split up into half a dozen tails, and he resolved to support the Government, and he would support them still³⁰¹ on this occasion, reserving to himself the right to vote against the appropriation of £50,000 for permanent Government buildings at Quebec. (Hear, hear.)³⁰²

DR. SOUTHWICK knew, when the present Administration was first formed, ... that he would incur much odium through extending to its member his support.³⁰³ He knew very well that it could not be a popular administration, except for the purpose of disposing of those great measures which they undertook when they assumed office; or he might confine the remark to a single measure, that for settling the Clergy Reserve question, which had agitated Canada for many years. But he had promised the people he represented, that he would support any administration that would take up that question, and settle it satisfactorily to the people of Upper Canada. That was the only ground on which any Reformer in Canada could have supported the coalition government. The matter had now been disposed of to his satisfaction, and he believed the country would yet do ample justice to the men who had settled that great question³⁰⁴. He, therefore, felt greatly concerned now at the course he should have to take in obedience to his serious convictions,³⁰⁵ and it was with regret and sorrow that he now found himself compelled to support this amendment. (Hear, hear.) He considered it utterly impossible for any administration to conduct the affairs of the country, unless they had the sympathies of the people, and on that ground he felt called on to record his vote against the present Administration. (Hear, hear.)³⁰⁶

Cheers on the Opposition side.³⁰⁷

[DR. SOUTHWICK continued:] He did not think it graceful or just for those hon. members who had supported them during two years, now to take up numerous causes of complaint against them; but

it must never be forgot that it is impossible for any Government to sustain itself beneficially, unless supported outside the House. (Hear, hear.)³⁰⁸ He felt that the press was against them, the public was against them, and they were subjected to the cross-fire of every party and section in the country. This being the case, he considered that a re-organization of the Ministry was necessary. (Hear, hear.) While he said this, he regretted exceedingly they had not a better system of Government. He regretted that they should have sat here in session for three months, and not done the work of three weeks. (Hear, hear.) As regarded the attacks made on the Postmaster General, he believed there never was a more popular officer in Canada at the head of the Post Office Department, or one who had more readily met the views of the people on all occasions. It had been said by the member for London that it had been by a sort of bargain and sale that the support of himself and the rest of the Reform party had been given to the Government — that they consented to support the Government for the sake of patronage in their respective counties. He denied that. When he went down to Quebec, he learned that the Ministry had been formed under Sir Allan McNab, and that they were to carry the Secularization of the Clergy Reserves. And he resolved on that ground to support the Administration, although Sir Allan MacNab otherwise was the last man he would have desired to see at the head of the Government. He had asked the Government for nothing in return for his support, and had in fact refrained from asking things [sic], the obtaining of which would have made him more popular in his county.³⁰⁹ It could not be for a moment gainsayed, that they had now utterly forfeited the confidence of the country. (Hear, hear.) And under the lash of that moral strength which could be derived alone from a healthy and honest public opinion, they are unable to conduct the business of the executive with decision, firmness and ability!³¹⁰ He therefore felt himself under the necessity of voting for the motion now before the house, and against the Administration.³¹¹

MR. ROBINSON thought it a singular thing that the hon. member who had last spoken, should have lost confidence in the Government, simply because they were opposed to all sorts of people.³¹²

MR. TERRILL made the same remark, and said the hon. member should have adhered all the more firmly to the Administration, now that they were so severely assailed. He should have stood forward on their behalf and faced that public opinion which was excited against them by the press at the disposal of gentlemen on the Opposition. He (Mr. T.) intended to support the Administration, at least to the close of the present session. (Laughter.)³¹³

MR. ROBLIN said the Government had passed all the measures they had promised to pass of their Reform predecessors, and he would not, like some other hon. members, assign that as a reason why he should no longer support them. He would continue to support them, so long as they introduced good measures. It was the members for Victoria and Northumberland who came to him from Mr. Hincks and first intimated to him the proposition about forming a Coalition Government. He was taken a little aback at first, but consented to take an oar in the boat, and he would not now be the man to scuttle the vessel, or hand it over to pirates. Mr. Roblin proceeded to give some explanations about the system of cashing Board of Works certificates, which he said had been in existence ever since there was a Board of Works. He also defended the Government, amidst the ironical cheers of the house, for having introduced the Police Bill, for which he said there was a necessity in the country.³¹⁴ [He] preferred the present Ministry to the Opposition, and blamed the latter for impeding public business.³¹⁵

MR. GOULD briefly stated his reasons for supporting the motion of want of confidence. He thought the system was very much to blame. He did not think any Administration, so long as they were connected with Lower Canada, could carry on the government for two years, in such a way as to retain the confidence of the people of Upper Canada.³¹⁶ He believed the American system to be the only one that could succeed in this part of the world.³¹⁷ He believed with the member for Elgin that the Coalition had accomplished their mission, and that the necessity which existed for its formation was now at an end.³¹⁸

MR. STEVENSON vindicated the character of the Lower Canadians. Hon. gentlemen seemed to treat them as they did the Ministry — when they had fulfilled the object which the Reform party of themselves could not, then they set them aside. A more unmanly position could not be taken up.³¹⁹ The Opposition were annoyed because the Ministry had deprived them of political capital. He should be sorry to find such members supporting any ministry which he supported.³²⁰ Mr. Stevenson then alluded to the petitions which had been presented on the subject of representation. One of them was presented by the member for Lambton, purporting to be from E. Burnham and others of the town of Picton. He had examined the petition and found it was a fabrication — (hear, hear) — that there was not the name of one inhabitant of Picton attached to it. The other petitions might have been got up in the same way.³²¹

MR. BROWN, having sent for the petition referred to, said the hon. member had asserted that he (Mr. B.) had presented a petition, purporting to be from Picton, and that on examination he found there was not a single name attached to it from Prince Edward, and he stated further that all petitions were of the same character.³²²

MR. STEVENSON. — I said they might be of the same character.³²³

MR. BROWN. — Well, “might be of the same character.” What must the house think of the hon. gentleman, when he stated what the fact was? On the outside there was a docquet — “Petition of E. Burnham and others, of the town of Picton” — but inside it commences — “the petition of the undersigned inhabitants of the town of *Peterboro*” — (hear, hear) — and a large number of names were attached to it, of most respectable inhabitants of Peterboro. (Hear, hear.) It was a mere error of the clerk, in docqueting the outside of the petition. Every name to it was genuine, yet the hon. member for Prince Edward placed it before the house as a fabrication! (Hear, hear.)³²⁴

MR. DALY had not originally supported the Government, but he was satisfied with their measures, and believed them to be deserving of confidence.³²⁵ He had been connected with the opposition for two months, but he left them because he found they had not one feeling in common. The only common feeling they had was to destroy the Administration. He (Mr. Daly) meant to support the Government through good report and through bad report.³²⁶

MR. SCATCHERD. — We were too poor on this side to keep you.³²⁷

Some personal discussion took place, in which MESSRS. SANBORN and FOLEY took part, in regard to Mr. Daly's desertion of the Opposition, although he had put his name to a document, declaring that the desertion of principle by the men forming the Coalition was most demoralizing in its tendency, and should be frowned upon by every honest and upright man.³²⁸

MR. CONGER declared his sentiments in favour of sustaining the present Administration, as he could not see where a better [one] could be got.³²⁹ [He] had given the Government an independent support, voting for or against them, as he felt it right. He could see no sufficient reason for the present motion, and would support the Government on the present vote, although he should oppose any appropriation for buildings at Quebec.³³⁰

DR. MASSON moved that in the motion of Mr. Macbeth, the words “this day three weeks” and the words “and to take precedence immediately after Mr. Brown's motion on separate school[s]” be struck out, and that the words “for Tuesday next” be inserted instead of the words “this day three weeks.”³³¹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the motion, if carried, would preclude the Ministry from going on with public business so long as the vote of want of confidence was pending.³³² [He] hoped

the hon. gentleman would withdraw the motion, as the Government did not wish to continue for that period, with this motion of want of confidence hanging over them.³³³

The motions both of Mr. Masson and Mr. Macbeth were then withdrawn.³³⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said he thought it his duty to make a few observations upon the subject before the House, and which had occupied the attention of the House so long.³³⁵ He did so, not because the Government required him to say anything in its support, for several of those gentlemen who have hitherto accorded it their support, have expressed themselves favorable to its continuance, and were he to consult his own feelings, he thought that after the able speech of his honorable colleague, the Postmaster-General, a speech that will be long remembered in this country, long after this Administration shall be a thing of the past, after that speech he should be content not to add one single word to the strong grounds [th]ere presented, upon which we claim to have the confidence of the House. They had had a strong, willing and hearty support from a number of hon. gentlemen in this House, and for that support he and his colleagues felt deeply grateful, because it was one of the few things which encouraged a public man in this country to have the favorable opinion of honorable gentlemen with whom he acted, with those who know all his troubles and all his trials, and can come forward and state, as several hon. gentlemen have now done, that he and his colleagues have faithfully performed the duty which they undertook. The only attack made upon the Government upon this occasion was that they had performed their mission too faithfully and well — they had not left one pledge unfulfilled — they had not left one promise unperformed — and the House knows whether they have not earnestly, anxiously, and honestly tried to carry out those pledges they made when they took office. It is true they had not been able to please every one. They had not been able to please those who did not at the first give them their confidence, and who were not inclined to look favorably upon their honest and anxious endeavors to carry on the business of this country. But he believed they had satisfied the majority of the members of this house, and that in all the measures that will be pressed upon the attention of this House, they would have the good feeling and the good will of the majority of the people of Upper Canada. They were told, however, that a coalition Government could not act with vigor. Their acts gave the lie to such an assertion. He would ask if ever there was a Government since Canada was Canada that had encountered and carried through more measures.³³⁶ Had they not, in the face of an able and zealous opposition, carried through measures for the settlement of questions which had long agitated Canada, and had hung over it for many years as a dark cloud?³³⁷ They had settled these measures decidedly and for ever. Was it not a fact that this Government had taken up that great question of the Clergy Reserves that old stalking horse upon which so many aspiring politicians rode. Whatever other question may hereafter convulse Canada and set man against man — citizen against citizen — friend against friend — that question at least will never set neighbor against neighbor. No more will armed men rise in rebellion on account of this great question — inasmuch as it is settled finally and for ever. That question was surrounded with difficulties. Ministry after Ministry shrunk under it. This Ministry undertook it and for ever removed it from being the source of heart-burning and strife in the family and at the poll. But it was said, “you have settled it in such a way as largely to endow certain favored churches.” But, supposing they had, was there not a necessity for compromise? Had not the Churches of England and Scotland rightly or wrongly supposed they had a vested right in that property, and would they not have felt they were suffering a grievous wrong, if they were deprived of everything? The Government had also had the courage to grapple with that hydra-headed monster, the Seigniorial Tenure question. He thought the Government had shown a great deal of vigour in introducing such a measure as the Militia Bill, knowing that no measure involving expense was popular. For this measure, however, they had received the thanks of their Sovereign, and he doubted not the thanks of the many young men all over the country, who had enrolled themselves under its provisions. Hon. gentleman [sic] said that Upper Canada was sacrificed to Lower Canada — that money was being constantly taken from the Consolidated Revenue for the benefit of Lower Canada. But was it not the work of this Government

that a system of Municipal reform had been introduced, and that Municipal Institutions had been given to the people of Lower Canada, under which they could tax themselves for their own local improvements. This Government, too, had the credit of having introduced the Elective principle into the Legislative Council. They were taunted for the want of administrative ability. He had regretted exceedingly the attacks made on the Postmaster General by his former friends, the members for Victoria and Peterborough? Had the country not to thank his hon. friend for removing the postage on newspapers, and carrying cheap intelligence to every man's door? Attacks had been made on the Crown Land's Commissioner. But the house knew the difficulties which had to be contended with in that department. His hon. friend had introduced an improved system, and had raised against himself the indignation of land jobbers; but he trusted his hon. friend would persist in it. Two charges were made against the Government for want of correctness in the public accounts, and that the reforms suggested by the Auditor General had not been carried out. It should be remembered that within the last few years, the country had advanced from the position of a large municipality to that of a nation, the result of which, was that the accounts became far more extensive and complicated. Mr. Langton was appointed Auditor General on his (the Attorney General's) recommendation. When he asked how he was to act, and what was his authority [sic], he (the Attorney General) pointed to the Audit Act, and said — "There is your authority; carry that out, and we will support you in doing so." Many improvements had been made by the Auditor, and the Inspector General, he had no doubt, would deliberately weigh and adopt, when they commended themselves to his judgment, other suggestions which might be made by that gentleman. He did not think it redounded much to the credit of some honourable gentlemen opposite, that they had kept back the Report of the Public Accounts Committee to be used against the Government in this debate. (Hear, hear.) And the way in which they had used the evidence of Mr. Langton was an unworthy betrayal of a generous confidence.³³⁸ The Committee on Public Accounts ... had been nominated with the consent of the government, — it consisted in great part of their political opponents, which proved that they had no desire to screen irregularities.³³⁹ The tug boat transaction with Mr. Baby, had already been vindicated. Mr. Baby had given up his old contract, and the new contract was made at a rate under what another ship owner would have agreed to take it at. Then about the Board of Works certificates, he believed the Inspector General had fully explained that. (No, no.) A grievous charge was brought against the present Government, as if this system had originated with them. It had been shown that this was not the case, and he was authorized by the Commissioner of the Board of Works to state that formal notice had now been given to the banks, that if they cashed those certificates it was at their own risk. And there was one case in which the banks had been informed that the certificate they had cashed would not be recognised.³⁴⁰

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER here left the chair, as it was 6 o'clock.³⁴¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the chair at eight o'clock.³⁴²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD resumed by stating that during the course of the debate, it had been stated that since the outset of the Administration, the Government had been altogether wanting in ability, and the present session had been instanced as a proof of this assertion. Now, he was very ready to admit that the Government had not attempted to startle that house, or the world at large from its propriety³⁴³ this session, — by introducing any extraordinary measure.³⁴⁴ But while admitting this, he would assert that the Government had got through much more really great and useful legislation than had ever been before attempted in one session by any one Administration. In addition to carrying through the Legislative Council ... and Clergy Reserves bills, they had a right to boast of their law reform bill³⁴⁵, which ... had met with the approval of the bench, and with the silent approval of the bar of Upper Canada.³⁴⁶ It was said that that measure was only a copy of some old English law. Now, if the hon. gentleman making that charge had only taken the trouble to read the synopsis of the bill, he would have found that

it was a consolidation and codification of all the improvements in practice adopted by the Law Reform Commissioners, and as such was a most useful and necessary measure. That measure had now passed the Upper House, and was about to become the law of the land.³⁴⁷ A similar measure for cheapening and simplifying law, applicable to the inferior courts, was now before the house³⁴⁸ and would, he hoped, become law before the closing of the session. Although those achievements might not be termed brilliant, they were, at least, real and lasting improvements.³⁴⁹ He could not speak with too much pride of the measures for the advancement of education in Lower Canada, introduced by his hon. friend the Provincial Secretary. (Ironical cries of hear, hear.)³⁵⁰ He thought the hon. Provincial Secretary had added to his laurels by the zeal with which he pressed his scholastic measures through the house. That measure was looked upon by him as an instance of the boldness and vigour which characterize the Administration; at least its Lower Canada section. The right appropriation of educational funds in Lower Canada had promised to be a fruitful source of disquietude and difficulty, but the ministry had boldly dealt with the question, and settled it in a manner that he believed would give satisfaction, notwithstanding the objections to it which had been raised in this house. It was a great improvement that the appropriations should be made by a permanent officer, rather than by a vote of the house on estimates brought down by the Government of the day. He believed the Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada would carry out faithfully and well the administration of the moneys committed to him. He thought he heard the member for North York say last night, as he woke up between two naps, that this was the most corrupt Government he ever knew of. It was all very well to talk of corruption and want of honesty, but he hoped for the sake of the hon. gentleman's head and heart, that he did not believe what he was saying, when he charged the present Government with being corrupt. He would like the hon. gentleman to point out an instance of corruption. He would like one member of the administration to be pointed out, whose character was stained by a corrupt act? Had not the Government been forsaken, not because they were too yielding, but because they were too firm? As to the North Shore Road, and in regard to the Grand Trunk schemes, the Government had tried to reconcile every interest, for the sake of the material improvement of the country. But he denied that by those schemes they had endeavoured to purchase support.³⁵¹ He had been asked why did not the Government come down with a scheme with ... reference to the Grand Trunk Railway? The answer was, that negotiations were still going on, which would probably be satisfactory both to the country and the Railway Company.³⁵² The Inspector General was endeavouring by every means to aid the Grand Trunk, and he hoped he would soon have a scheme perfected. It would have been the fair and open and manly way, if the question of want of confidence had been brought up directly. But it suited hon. gentlemen to take advantage of prejudices outside, and to work on Upper Canadian feeling, by hanging their motion on an appropriation, which the Government brought down in obedience to the expressed will of the house. Why had not honourable gentlemen complained before now, that the Seat of Government had been left an open question? If the majority of the House had accepted them with that as an open question, it would not be right to turn round now and vote want of confidence, just because they had left it an open question. Then, the Government was charged with a great want of vigour in the Corrigan case. The hon. member for London sneered at the Government accepting the vote on the previous question in that case, as a vote of confidence. But the Government asked it as a vote of confidence, and the House gave it to them as such. The Government asked the House to rescind the vote on the Duval address, in the full expectation that the member for Montreal and his friends would adhere to their vote.³⁵³ But they would not do so, led away by a desire for a party triumph, and the Government therefore found it necessary to appeal directly to the house, whether they continued to repose confidence in them or not. The Government had been charged with harshness in the removal of the Sheriff of Essex. It appeared that officer had never made any return of fines to the Receiver General's Department, since his appointment, although frequently called upon by letters, of which he took no notice. But one course therefore remained to the Government. The Attorney General next referred to a charge³⁵⁴ made by Mr. Brown,³⁵⁵ in regard to Militia Commissions being hawked about for political purposes in the County of Lambton³⁵⁶, and called the attention of Mr. Rankin to those remarks.³⁵⁷

Some explanation of the circumstances alluded to was given by MR. BROWN and by MR. RANKIN, the Colonel commanding the district, whom Mr. Brown acquitted of all censure in the matter.³⁵⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD continued. — It was clear that the Militia should not be made a political engine.³⁵⁹ The Government had been taunted for their want of vigour. But what useful measures had the Opposition introduced? The member for Lambton brought forward Buncombe motions about the Rectories and Representation by Population and such like. And the member for Haldimand had a similar motion about a Dissolution of the Union. But where were their measures? Were they reserving their thunder till they got on the Treasury Benches? (Hear, hear.)³⁶⁰ The fact was that these hon. gentlemen were now satisfied to be coiled up and concealed like the grub, but by-and-by they expected to burst their confinement and fly over to the other side of the House as butterflies. (Laughter.) Again, hon. gentlemen had stated that the Government being a Coalition Government, it had no common principle of action. Such an assertion [sic] was utterly groundless. The principles on which the Government was formed, had been well defined, and fully carried out, in all its acts.³⁶¹ The government was no longer a Coalition but a compact Government, and their aim was to pursue a policy equally removed from reactionary influences on the one hand, and from republican democracy on the other.³⁶² And notwithstanding all the furious and factious opposition it had encountered, he believed the present Government to be by far the most capable of guiding the destinies of Canada. It was a Government which could claim for itself the credit of not having been behind hand in any great or beneficial undertaking; and long after the present party excitement is forgotten, the country would do justice to their earnest, anxious and hearty desire to advance the best interests of the Province. (Applause.)³⁶³

MR. HARTMAN did not intend to detain the House at great length. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to refute the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite.³⁶⁴ [He] spoke in support of a statement that he has previously made, setting down the Government as a most corrupt one. He did not take the same view of the meaning of the word "corruption" as the Solicitor General West did, and he felt that the country attributed it to the present administration.³⁶⁵ He did not, he said, mean to charge the Government individually, with corruption; but as a Government, he did so. One of their last acts before assuming office was to denounce their predecessors, as steeped to the lips in corruption, and one of their first acts on taking their seats was, to adopt all the measures of that Government.³⁶⁶ He instanced the unauthorized expenditure on piers below Quebec as an act of corruption.³⁶⁷ But it was not necessary to go so far back. He maintained that opinion was confirmed within the last few days by the scheme proposed by the Government, to aid the Grand Trunk Railway — a scheme which had been denounced from one end of the Province to the other. He thought that if the Government did not attempt to retain their seats by some species of corruption, it looked remarkably like it.³⁶⁸ He (Mr. H.) never considered it a Coalition Government, and the Attorney General West and Solicitor General West both repudiated the idea. He believed that it was as essentially a Tory Government as could be, but he did not agree with the Attorney General West that it is composed of the moderate men of both parties, and that it is the constitutional party of the country, and that it would be a strong party and be maintained by the country. He (Mr. H.) did not think that they were entitled to the designation of "the strong party;" for with all their efforts to get rid of the Premier, they could not do so. Another instance of their want of strength was, that instead of increasing their numbers, they had decreased them.³⁶⁹ The Ministry themselves had accused members of the House of going into opposition, because their demands were not complied with. The Ministerial Reformers had all abandoned the government except four.³⁷⁰

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER supposed that Shak[s]peare must have had some idea of responsible Government, when he put into the mouth of one of his characters the sentiment: — "To be, or not to be." It was he thought, funny to hear hon. gentlemen stating so confidently that the Ministry had lost the confidence of the House. Now, as to the Lower Canada section he would ask had they withdrawn

their support? If they had, where was it gone to? But those gentlemen had not withdrawn their confidence. As to the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton,) who had introduced this amendment, he would assure that hon. gentleman that he³⁷¹ would be brought before his electors, Scotch, Irish, French Canadian, English, &c., to account for his political association with the hon. member for Lambton. (Hear, hear.)³⁷² [He] would never represent the city at [sic] Montreal again, (laughter). He had no political status.³⁷³ He was elected quite by accident. (Laughter.) It was at the very time when the cholera prevailed. (Great laughter.) His election was owing to that, and he might rest assured that he did not command the respect of the people of Montreal. (Hear, hear.)³⁷⁴ And the other member for Montreal was as bad. Neither hon. gentleman commanded the confidence of their constituents; and so far, as being regarded as their representatives by the people of Montreal, both hon. gentlemen would be hunted from the city for having followed the nauseous political banner of the hon. member for Lambton, (loud laughter). As for the hon. gentleman who was said to be representative of the commercial interests of Montreal, he (Mr. Cartier), would say that that was a fiction. The hon. gentleman alluded to, never represented the commercial interests of that city — being, in fact, merely connected with the forwarding business there. It was therefore assuming too much to put that hon. gentleman forward as the representative of the trade and commerce of that city. Nor did that hon. gentleman fairly represent the interests of his constituents in other respects. The hon. member did not vote for his (Mr. Cartier's) School bill — nor, in fact, for any great and useful measure. The consequence would be that that hon. gentleman would be hunted from Montreal, or else he would renounce the Satanic politics of the hon. member for Lambton. And all the Lower Canadian section of the opposition³⁷⁵ would meet the same treatment from their constituents (hear, hear,) for their alliance with the hon. member for Lambton. It was evident that if the hon. member [Mr. Brown] were to come into the ministry he would create a dangerous disturbance. (Laughter.) He wished to give the hon. member a little friendly advice. He (Mr. C.) had been looking very hard at him since the commencement of the session, and he could not help recommending him to go off immediately to a phrenologist or bumpologist (laughter) to have his bumps felt. (Laughter.) He could see by the conformation of the hon. gentleman's head that the bump of ideality was very well developed, but not "causality." (Laughter.)³⁷⁶ Il pourrait parier £1000 avec lui que s'il était enfermé dans une chambre avec des plumes, de l'encre et du papier, il ne pourrait pas produire un bill dans une forme qui pût être adoptée par la législature.³⁷⁷ If the hon. member did not mind himself, in about two years he would have as much weight in the house as the hon. member for Haldimand. He would now leave the jocular part of his argument (laughter) and would begin the serious portion of it. He then attacked the hon. members for Montreal (Mr. Holton) and for Lambton, vehemently in regard to their political positions.³⁷⁸ As to Upper Canada, it was said that the Upper Canada ministers had lost public confidence, because two stragglers had gone over to the opposition.³⁷⁹ He defended the part which the Government had taken in relation to the Grand Trunk Company, and indulged in further personalities [s]till.³⁸⁰

MR. A. DORION appealed to the Speaker whether the house, after its very long sitting should have its time wasted with these personalities which had no connection with the question before the chair.³⁸¹

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER went on to reflect on the interest the members for Sherbrooke and Montreal had in the Grand Trunk, as contractors for the Toronto and Sarnia section. He then referred to the connection the same gentlemen had had with the St. Lawrence and Atlantic section, and said they were the only parties who had made profit out of the Grand Trunk. He did not think the member for Sherbrooke would be a good successor to the Inspector General, whose fingers were clean of all sorts of speculations. Mr. Cartier then proceeded to take credit to himself for his Education Bills.³⁸²

DR. VALOIS. — They are great bills!³⁸³

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER hoped the hon. member did not say that sneeringly or sarcastically. The next topic he took up was the union of the two provinces. He did not think a strong Government

could be formed, comprising men who held that the Union ought to be repealed. How could they take the official oath that they would do all in their power faithfully to work it?³⁸⁴

MR. HOLTON, in reply to what the Provincial Secretary had just stated, said that owing to the lateness of the hour, he would not say much, although he might claim his privilege if he wished of repelling the attack that had been made upon him. He condemned the manner in which the last speaker had taken up the time of the House in speaking of things anterior to the subject of debate. He could not enter into a contest with that gentleman, but at the same time, it would have been far better for that gentleman, if he had sufficient self-possession to have refrained from all personal remarks on this occasion. He (Mr. Holton) could not get rid of the idea that the hon. gentleman had been set on by those on the other side of the House to make one of those incoherent speeches which that hon. gentleman so frequently indulges in. He (Mr. H.) regretted very much, when listening to the Attorney General West, that he (Mr. Macdonald) did not take a leading part in this debate. As if he had done so, all the personal recrimination that the House was forced to listen to, would have been spared. It would have done away with some of those disgraceful remarks that had been made on members on this side of the House; as also that very unprovoked attack upon himself (Mr. Holton). It would have been much better if the Government had contented themselves with replying to the attack on themselves, instead of indulging in personal abuse. The Provincial Secretary had stated that he (Mr. Holton) had sought to fill his place. But after the able display made by that hon. gentleman to-night, he might be permitted to hold his office by self-respect. He would not take up the time of the House any further, but would allow the House to go to the vote.³⁸⁵

The vote was then taken on Mr. Holton's motion³⁸⁶.

(537) And the Question being put on the Amendment to the proposed Amendment to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply); the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

(538) YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Bell, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Cameron, Christie, Cook, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Merritt, Munro, Murney, Niles, Papin, Patrick, Powell, Rankin, Rolph, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Valois, Wilson, and Wright. — (47.)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Fellowes, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Mongenais, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding. — (70.)

So it passed in the Negative.

The result ... [was] received with cheers from the ministerial side.³⁸⁷

MR. BROWN stated that the Upper Canada majority against the Government was 33 to 27³⁸⁸.

[This] announcement ... was received with cheers from the Opposition.³⁸⁹

The question being next put on Mr. Papin's amendment,³⁹⁰

MR. RANKIN said he did not consider the ministry were bound to resign, although they had lost the confidence of a majority of the Upper Canada constituencies. He was not in favour of the double majority system. But he did not think the men now composing the Government were possessed of sufficient force of character to carry on advantageously the administration of the affairs of the country.³⁹¹

The division was next taken on Mr. Papin's amendment³⁹².

(538) And the Question being put on the Amendment to the original Question; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Cameron, Christie, Cook, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Merritt, Munro, Murney, Niles, Papin, Patrick, Rankin, Rolph, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Valois, Wilson, and Wright. — (43.)

(538-539)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Bureau, Burton, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Fellowes, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laberge, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Marchildon, Meagher, Mongenais, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding. — (73.)

So it passed in the Negative.

On the question that the Speaker do leave the chair, for the house to go into Committee of Supply,³⁹³

MR. MACKENZIE moved in amendment, "That the Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that it be resolved, that the best interests of Upper Canada would be promoted by a repeal of the Union, now existing between the two sections of the Province."³⁹⁴

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND ... stated that the Government only intended to go into committee *pro forma*, and that the hon. member would have another opportunity of submitting his motion.³⁹⁵

MR. MACKENZIE withdrew his motion.³⁹⁶

The House then went into Committee, Mr. Mackenzie being called to the chair amid loud laughter.³⁹⁷

(539) Then the main Question being put;
Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.
The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee;

On motion of MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY,³⁹⁸

The Committee rose, and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.³⁹⁹

(539) and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mackenzie reported, That the Committee had made some progress, and directed him to move for leave to sit again.
Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Friday next.

A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fenning Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery: —

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council have passed the following Bills, without Amendment; viz: —

Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorize *William Weller* to hold and convey the *Canada Grand Trunk Telegraph Line*:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Charter of the *Ontario, Simcoe, and Lake Huron Railroad Union Company*:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to vest certain Road allowances in the Township of *Brantford*, in *George S. Wilkes*:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to enable the Municipal Council of the Town of *Cornwall* to appropriate the surplus of certain moneys raised for making a macadamized Road:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend, repeal, and consolidate the provisions of certain Acts therein mentioned, and to simplify and expedite the proceedings in the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in *Upper Canada*:"

Bill, intituled, "An Act to make better provision for promotion of Superior Education and the establishment and support of Normal Schools in *Lower Canada*, and for other purposes:" And also,

The Legislative Council have passed the Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the *Quebec and St. Francis Mining and Exploring Company*," with an Amendment, to which they desire the concurrence of this House.

And then he withdrew.

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Drummond*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Lemieux*,

The House adjourned.⁴⁰⁰

Appendix

[DISCUSSION RE: THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY'S POST OFFICE.]

MR. FELTON called the attention of the House to the fact that the members could not obtain their letters from the Post Office of the House on Sundays. Members, far removed from their families as the members of this House were, should not be debarred from receiving their letters the moment they reached the city.⁴⁰¹ He thought some system should be adopted by which members could get their letters on that day at any time.⁴⁰²

MR. PAPIN hoped the hon. gentleman had not seized upon this particular opportunity to bring up this matter to embarrass the Government.⁴⁰³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said he understood the complaint was that the letters could not be obtained from the local office. That office was not under his control⁴⁰⁴, but under that of the house.⁴⁰⁵ So far as the city office was concerned, every convenience was afforded, and he had given instructions that every facility should be afforded to the officers here relative to the letters for hon. members. The office was open on Sundays from 9 to 10 o'clock in the morning. As it was found that one opportunity was enough, he had selected the hours from 9 to 10 as being most conducive to the comfort of those connected with the department.⁴⁰⁶

MR. CASAULT said the Postmaster in Toronto had not paid the same courtesy toward the members of this House as the Postmaster in Quebec had done. The Postmaster of Quebec had kept his office open all day in order to suit the convenience of the Legislature. He did not see why the Post Office of Toronto should not be open all day on Sunday.⁴⁰⁷

MR. J. DORION said that complaint had been made upon the subject of the Post Office in the early part of the session; and yet things were getting no better. If it was conceded that the Post Office should be closed upon the Sabbath, well. But if not, the office might as well be opened in the afternoon, as well as the morning. It was very deplorable that letters should be left in the City Post Office for twenty-four hours.⁴⁰⁸

MR. BROWN hoped the present system at all events, would not be altered. (Hear, hear.) It was quite unnecessary that the Post-office should be opened on Sunday. Hon. members could accommodate themselves to it, and the small loss of time occasioned was really of little consequence. He had a Bill before the house which embraced the subject and it would no doubt soon be reached. To force at this time the opening of the Post-office when it is not required, and no complaints are made by citizens would be setting a most injurious example.⁴⁰⁹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said the case was rather different at Quebec. There, no mail arrived after seven or eight o'clock in the morning. Here they arrived at all hours of the day.⁴¹⁰

MR. HOLTON was opposed to the Post Office being open on the Sabbath day at all. But the point was that the office might as well be opened for an hour in the afternoon as in the morning.⁴¹¹

MR. FORTIER said the difficulty might be obviated by procuring the services of a couple of Jews to attend the office on Sundays.⁴¹²

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE explained why a charge [sic] had been made on the Post Office arrangement. It had been done at the suggestion of persons anxious to get rid of Sabbath labor in the Post office. He would look into the matter and if it was found that one delivery could be suggested which would better accommodate all parties, he would readily adopt it.⁴¹³

The subject ... dropped.⁴¹⁴

Footnotes

1. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856. The speech is inserted at this point in the proceedings in conformity with the information reported in *Globe*, 20 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856, *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856, and *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
2. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856. *Globe*, 20 May 1856, reports a short summary of this speech in which it is stated that Mr. Bowes "attacked the course taken by the member for Essex, in having voted with the Government on all important questions, and afterwards coming down to support the motion of want of confidence."
3. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
4. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
6. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856. The discussion regarding the Stanstead Bank is inserted at this point in the proceedings in conformity with the information reported in *Globe*, 20 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856, *Hamilton Spectator*

Semi Weekly, 21 May 1856, and *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856. A commentary on the Stanstead Bank is reported in *Globe*, 29 May 1856.

7. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
8. Telegraph (*Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856).
9. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
11. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
12. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
13. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
14. Telegraph (*Montreal Transcript*, 21 May 1856).
15. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
16. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
17. Telegraph (*Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856).
18. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
19. Telegraph (*Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856).
20. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
23. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
24. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
25. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
26. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856. Telegraph (*Montreal Gazette*, 20 May 1856), reports that "Sir Allan McNab was brought into the House in his chair amid the applause of his more intimate friends, and sat for some time beside the Treasury benches."
27. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
32. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
33. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
34. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
35. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
36. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
37. Telegraph (*Montreal Transcript*, 21 May 1856).
38. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
39. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
40. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
42. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
43. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
44. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
47. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
51. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
55. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
56. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
57. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856, differs from this source and reports that Mr. Terrill said "that although the Bills were signed by the proper office[r]s of the Government, they bore no legal signature of any party

connected with the Bank. There was, therefore, no persons [sic] responsible for the notes, and they were valueless." Telegraph (*Pilot*, 20 May 1856), reports that the gentleman said "he understood that even the notes which had been countersigned, were really signed by no person, that the apparent signatures to the notes of the Bank officers were only lithographed."

58. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
59. *Ibid.*
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
62. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
63. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
64. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
66. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
67. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
69. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
70. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
71. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
72. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
73. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
74. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
75. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
76. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
77. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
78. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
79. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
80. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
81. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
82. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856, reports that Mr. Wilson was interrupted at about this point by the delivery of a Message from the Legislative Council, reported in the *Journals* on page (532) 2130, after which he resumed his speech.
83. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
85. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
86. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
87. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
88. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
89. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
91. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
92. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
93. *Ibid.*
94. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
95. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
96. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
97. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
98. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
99. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
100. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
101. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
102. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
103. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
104. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
105. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
106. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
107. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.

108. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
109. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
110. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
111. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
112. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
113. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
114. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
115. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
116. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
117. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
118. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
119. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
120. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
121. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
122. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
123. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
124. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
125. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
126. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
127. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
128. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
129. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
130. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
131. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
132. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
133. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. A few words in this excerpt are illegible, but they were reconstituted with the help of the report in *Montreal Gazette*, 24 May 1856, which copies the *Globe*.
134. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
135. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
136. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
137. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
138. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
139. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
140. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
141. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
142. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
143. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
144. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
145. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
146. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
147. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
148. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
149. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
150. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
151. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
152. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
153. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 21 May 1856, reports that Mr. Felton "replied at length to the arguments on the opposite side."
155. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
156. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
157. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
158. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
159. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
160. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
161. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.

162. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
163. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
164. *Ibid.*
165. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
166. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
167. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
168. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
169. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
170. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
171. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
172. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
173. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
174. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
175. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
176. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
177. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
178. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
179. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
180. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
181. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
182. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
183. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
184. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
185. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
186. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
187. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
188. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
189. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
190. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
191. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
192. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
193. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
194. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
195. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
196. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
197. *Pilot*, 23 May 1856.
198. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
199. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
200. *Ibid.*
201. *Ibid.*
202. *Ibid.*
203. *Ibid.*
204. *Ibid.*
205. *Ibid.*
206. *Ibid.*
207. *Ibid.*
208. *Ibid.*
209. *Ibid.*
210. *Ibid.*
211. *Ibid.*
212. *Ibid.*
213. *Ibid.*
214. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
215. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
216. *Ibid.*
217. *Ibid.*

218. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
219. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
220. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
221. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
222. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
223. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
224. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
225. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
226. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
227. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
228. *Ibid.*
229. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
230. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
231. *Ibid.*
232. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
233. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
234. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
235. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856, reports that Mr. Papin "alleged several reasons why the House should adjourn, naming several members who had long speeches."
236. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
237. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
238. *Ibid.*
239. *Ibid.*
240. *Ibid.*
241. *Ibid.*
242. *Ibid.*
243. *Ibid.*
244. *Ibid.*
245. *Ibid.*
246. *Ibid.*
247. *Ibid.*
248. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. *Western Planet*, 2 June 1856, reports a commentary regarding the late arrival of certain members in the House and the tactics used by the Opposition to prevent the vote being taken until those members were present. Other similar commentaries on this subject are reported in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856, *Globe*, 21 May 1856, and *Le Pays*, 23 May 1856.
249. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
250. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
251. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
252. *Ibid.*
253. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
254. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. The newspapers reporting this debate give only a brief amount of information regarding the discussion and the motions that were made between 4:15 a.m. and noon on 20 May 1856. The *Journals* report several motions of adjournment on pages (534-537) 2153-2155, which appear to correspond to this part of the sitting.
255. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856. In a commentary, *Globe*, 20 May 1856, reports the following information: "The adjournment was loudly demanded, but, having mustered all their forces and some members of the opposition being absent, the Government supporters insisted on taking the vote. Mr. Roderick Macdonald made a motion of adjournment, but it was voted down".
256. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856. This newspaper further reports that "to adjourn the debate, however, and allow the reinforcements to arrive, the Ministerial supporters would not consent, and the debate continued".
257. *Globe*, 20 May 1856. This newspaper does not specify which of the two Messrs. Dorion spoke, but does note that it was then around 5 o'clock in the morning.
258. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. In a commentary, this newspaper reports a few remarks on this motion.
259. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 23 May 1856.
260. *Ibid.*
261. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 23 May 1856, comments that "Mr. Macbeth tried to get rid of it, and Mr. Crawford disclaimed it, amidst roars of laughter".

262. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 23 May 1856. This newspaper also comments that "Mr. Macbeth then ran out of the chamber and Mr. Crawford looked awfully serious. Much mirth was the result and the ... motion served the opposition as a subject of debate till the full strength of Upper Canada arrived".
263. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. The *Journals* report two motions for an adjournment until twelve o'clock, one by Mr. Foley, the other by Mr. Murney. They are reported on pages (535-536) 2154.
264. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
265. *Ibid.*
266. *Ibid.*
267. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. This excerpt is taken from a commentary.
268. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
269. *Ibid.*
270. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856. *Globe*, 21 May 1856, specifies that "Messrs. James and Sidney Smith, Flint and Supple, ... arrived shortly after noon."
271. *Ibid.*
272. *Ibid.*
273. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
274. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
275. *Ibid.*
276. *Ibid.*
277. *Ibid.*
278. *Ibid.*
279. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
280. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
281. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
282. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856. *Globe*, 21 May 1856, reports this statement in the following manner: "Since he had been in the house on Friday night, he had been among his constituents, Reform and Conservative, and he had not found one man, of whatever hue of politics, who had not urged him to be in his place, before going to Europe, to give at least one vote to turn out the Upper Canada section of the Government, for the sake of the country, at whatever sacrifice of personal convenience."
283. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
284. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
285. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
286. *Ibid.*
287. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
288. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856, reports that "Mr. Smith proceeded to charge the Postmaster General with having opened post-offices where they are not required, but, on being questioned, could not mention one case in point."
289. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
290. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
291. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
292. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
293. *Ibid.*
294. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
295. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
296. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
297. *Ibid.*
298. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
299. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
300. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
301. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
302. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
303. *Ibid.*
304. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
305. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
306. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
307. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
308. *Ibid.*

309. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
310. *Pilot*, 26 May 1856.
311. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
312. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856, reports that Mr. Robinson "replied, accusing the last speaker with ingratitude."
313. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
314. *Ibid.*
315. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
316. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
317. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
318. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
319. *Ibid.*
320. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
321. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
322. *Ibid.*
323. *Ibid.*
324. *Ibid.*
325. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
326. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
327. *Ibid.*
328. *Ibid.*
329. *Ibid.*
330. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
331. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. There seems to have been some confusion regarding Mr. Macbeth's motion, as this newspaper previously reported it as a motion to adjourn the debate "for five weeks" (see page 2152). *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856, concurs with this information.
332. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
333. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
334. *Ibid.*
335. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856. *Globe*, 21 May 1856, notes that Mr. J.A. Macdonald rose to address the House at 5 o'clock.
336. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
337. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
338. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
339. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
340. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
341. *Ibid.*
342. *Ibid.*
343. *Ibid.*
344. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
345. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
346. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
347. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
348. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
349. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
350. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
351. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
352. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
353. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
354. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
355. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
356. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
357. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
358. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
359. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
360. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.

361. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
362. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
363. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856. This newspaper reports in a commentary that Mr. J.A. Macdonald spoke for two hours. *Globe*, 21 May 1856, reports similar information.
364. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
365. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
366. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
367. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
368. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
369. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
370. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
371. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
372. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
373. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
374. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
375. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
376. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
377. *L'Avenir*, 30 May 1856.
378. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
379. *Morning Chronicle*, 24 May 1856.
380. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. *Globe*, 22 May 1856, reports a short commentary regarding Mr. Cartier's speech, in which it is stated that the gentleman, referring to Mr. Brown, said that "he solemnly averred, that were his name to appear among the members of a new Government, that fact alone would produce open disturbance throughout Lower Canada — almost revolution." It also reports that "the tirade of the Provincial Secretary was not replied to by the Opposition." *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856, comments on Mr. Cartier's recriminations as well.
381. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
382. *Ibid.*
383. *Ibid.*
384. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. Several newspapers note that Mr. Cartier addressed the House at length. *Globe*, 21 May 1856, in a commentary, remarks that the gentleman spoke for "one or two hours".
385. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
386. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
387. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856, reports that "the result of the vote was received with great applause from both sides of the House." In a commentary, *Perth Courier*, 30 May 1856, reports the following information: "[The vote] was received with cheers from both sides of the House — the Ministerialists cheering because they had a majority of the whole House, and the Opposition cheering because they had an Upper Canada majority against the Ministry. Both parties claimed the victory".
388. *Globe*, 21 May 1856. In a commentary, this newspaper notes the following: "There were only five Upper Canadians absent from the vote, and of these we do not hesitate to claim four for the opposition, Messrs. Fergus[s]on, Ferrie, Matheson, and James Ross. Sir Allan McNab was the fifth. This would give a majority of NINE from Upper Canada against the ministry." *Montreal Gazette*, 23 May 1856, also reports similar comments.
389. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
390. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
391. *Ibid.*
392. *Ibid.*
393. *Ibid.*
394. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856. In a commentary, *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 23 May 1856, reports that Mr. Mackenzie said "he would waive his right if the government would assy [sic] they intended only to go into committee pro forma, and would renew it next Friday."
395. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
396. *Ibid.*
397. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856.
398. *Globe*, 21 May 1856.
399. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856. Commentaries on the debate of 19 and 20 May 1856 regarding the motion of want of confidence are reported in *Globe*, 21 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856, *Montreal Transcript*, 22 May 1856, *Montreal Gazette*, 23 May 1856, *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 23 May 1856, and *Western Planet*, 2 June 1856.

400. *Globe*, 21 May 1856, reports that "the house then adjourned at half-past eleven, after having been in continuous session for 32 hours and a half." *Toronto Daily Leader*, 22 May 1856, reports similar information.
401. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856. According to this newspaper and to *Globe*, 20 May 1856, this discussion occurred on 19 May 1856, immediately after the short debate regarding the Stanstead Bank.
402. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
403. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
404. *Ibid.*
405. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
406. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
407. *Ibid.*
408. *Ibid.*
409. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.
410. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
411. *Ibid.*
412. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856. This newspaper does not indicate whether the speaker was Mr. O. Fortier or Dr. T. Fortier.
413. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 20 May 1856.
414. *Globe*, 20 May 1856.

WEDNESDAY, 21 MAY 1856

(540)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Bell*, — The Petition of *William Moorhouse* and others, of the Township of *Lanark*; and the Petition of *Holmes Mair* and others, of the Township of *Lanark*.

By Mr. *Jean Baptiste Daoust*, — The Petition of *Oscar Barcelo*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *Ste. Scholastique*; the Petition of the Reverend *F. Bourgeault* and others, of the Parish of *St. Joseph*, County of *Two Mountains*; the Petition of *Casimir Leroux*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. Placide*; the Petition of the Reverend *P. Poulin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Hermas*; the Petition of *D. Dupraz*, Mayor, and others, of the Village [sic] of *Ste. Scholastique*; and the Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of *Two Mountains*.

By Mr. *Mongenais*, — The Petition of *H. Cartier* and others, Members of the Municipalities of the Village and Parish of *Vaudreuil*.

By Mr. *Marchildon*, — The Petition of *Joseph Mongrain* and others.

By Mr. *Dionne*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Jean Baptiste de l'Isle Verte*.

By Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*, — The Petition of *J. Dorion* and others, of the Parish of *St. Ours*, County of *Richelieu*.

By Mr. *Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion*, — The Petition of *Jean Baptiste Langevin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jacques LeMineur*.

By Mr. *Biggar*, — The Petition of the Town Council of the Town of *Brantford*.

By Mr. *Guévremont*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Pierre de Sorel*; and the Petition of the Town Council of the Town of *William Henry*.

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH rose and said — I feel it my duty, Mr. Speaker, to move that the house do now adjourn. I need scarcely say that I ask for the adjournment of the house, in consequence of the vote that took place last night on the motion of the member for Montreal. You will see that the members of the Government are not in their seats, and I am instructed to say that they are now engaged in council, consulting on matters of state connected with that vote. (Hear, hear, and cries of carried.)¹

The motion was agreed to, without discussion².

(540)

Then, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by Mr. *Fellowes*,
The House adjourned until Friday next.³

Footnotes

1. *Globe*, 22 May 1856.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Globe*, 22 May 1856, reports that "the house adjourned till Friday, the intervening day, Thursday, being a statutory holiday."

FRIDAY, 23 MAY 1856¹

(540) MR. SPEAKER informed the House, that the Serjeant-at-Arms had (with his approbation) appointed *William C. Burrage*, Esquire, to act as his Deputy, during a temporary indisposition.

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB, on entering the house, unaccompanied by any of the other members of the late Administration, was loudly cheered.²

(540) The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —
By Mr. *Mackenzie*, — The Petition of *Hugh Crea* and others, of the Town of *Port Hope*; and the Petition of *James Vollar*, late a Messenger of the Legislative Assembly.
By Mr. *Bowes*, — The Petition of *F.C. Capreol*, on behalf of the Metropolitan Gas and Water Company of *Toronto*.
By Mr. *Chapais*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. André*.
By Mr. *Darche*, — The Petition of *Damase Daignault* and others, of the Parish of *Chambly*.
By Mr. *Mongenais*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Jeanne de l'Isle Perrot*.

(541) By Mr. *Brown*, — The Petition of *Peter Grieve* and others, of the Township of *Arthur*; and the Petition of *Richard Wilson* and others, of the Township of *Euphemia*.
By Mr. *Bell*, — The Petition of *James Murray* and others, of the Town of *Middleville*.
By Mr. *Guévremont*, — The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of *Richelieu*.
By the Honorable Mr. *Chabot*, — The Petition of *O. Robitaille*, Esquire, Mayor, and others, of the City of *Quebec*.
By Mr. *Aikins*, — The Petition of *Andrew Buckham* and others, of the United Counties of *York* and *Peel*.
By Mr. *Alleyn*, — The Petition of the Honorable *G.R.S. de Beaujeu*, of *Coteau du Lac*.

On motion of the Honorable Mr. *Chabot*, seconded by Mr. *Alleyn*,
Ordered, That the Petition of *O. Robitaille*, Esquire, Mayor, and others, of the City of *Quebec*, be now received and read, and the Rules of this House suspended as regards the same.
And the said Petition was received and read; representing that the complaints made in the several Petitions presented against *John Maguire*, Esquire, Police Magistrate of the said City, are devoid of truth and groundless, and instigated by feelings of personal animosity, — and that the duties of his office are performed by him in a most satisfactory manner; and praying the adoption of measures for the protection of the said *John Maguire*.³

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB ... said, Mr. Speaker I have a few words to offer to the House, and from my long protracted illness I have not the power to stand. I have therefore to ask permission of the House to address it without rising.⁴

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the House would cheerfully give him permission.⁵

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB proceeded, sitting in his chair. In consequence of the events of the last few days, which must be well known to every member, I left my house to-day for the purpose of explaining at the earliest possible moment to the representatives of the people of this Province, the reasons which have induced the members of the present Administration to resign the several offices they held, and which they now only hold until their successors are appointed. I attach, as regards myself personally, at my period of life, and considering the long period of time that I have had the honour of serving

the people of this country as a member of this house — I attach a good deal of consequence to the explanations that I shall feel myself bound to give to this house. On my way here, I was met by Attorney General Drummond, who informed me that it was not the intention of my colleagues to be present to-day, but that they had instructed my learned friend, the Solicitor General West, to move an adjournment of the house till Monday. I am most anxious to give to the people of this country, what they have a right to expect at my hands, and what I have a right to give to the representatives of the people — the reasons which have induced the members of the Government to retire from the positions they held, and my reasons for saying to His Excellency that, while I could not by any act of mine identify myself with those reasons which had been given by my colleagues, I yet felt it my duty to say to him that he was at perfect liberty to make use of my office in any manner he thought proper, if it should become necessary to do so in forming a new Administration. My colleagues desired that these explanations should not be given till Monday. I am most anxious to give them, but I feel it due to those hon. gentlemen to say nothing more on that subject till they are present, when I shall endeavour to make a statement of the reasons which were given by those honourable gentlemen for retiring from their several offices, and the reasons which induced me to differ from my colleagues, on, as I considered, very important questions. I, therefore, am precluded by a sense of justice towards those gentlemen from giving those reasons to-day. And I will only now add that I very much regret that the state of my health, the severe indisposition I have suffered, has prevented me from discharging my duty in the house during the present session of Parliament. I have been a member of this house for 26 years, and during all that period I have not been so long absent from my duty altogether, as I have been during this session. I think the people of this country will receive that from a man of my age as a sufficient excuse. (Applause.) If I could have been here, depend upon it I should have been in my place. And hon. gentlemen will recollect that during [the] last session of Parliament for seven months, I was not absent from my seat for a day. Under these circumstances I am sure that no other reason but the true one will be ascribed for my absence. I again regret that I am not in a position to give, what I feel it my duty to give, and what I feel the house has a right to expect at my hands — (hear, hear,) — the reasons which have induced the late Government to resign their offices. I can say nothing more, but shall endeavour to be in my place to meet these gentlemen on Monday — (hear, hear,) — for the purpose of making such statements as I think it becomes me, as the first Minister of the Crown in the late Government, to give to the people of this country. And to the people of this country I confidently appeal for their verdict on the course I have taken. If I am supported by their voice, I shall feel I am right, and if I am condemned, I am ready to retire into private life, and, perhaps, at my period of life, I am now fit for little else.⁶ (Great applause.)⁷

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — I move that the House do adjourn.⁸

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said — I am sure the manly declaration of the gallant Knight, the member for Hamilton, will be re-echoed by this house; for we must all feel that some explanation is due to the country, in relation to the extraordinary position in which we are now placed. And we must all feel sympathy for the gallant Knight, in the afflictions with which it has pleased Providence to visit him during this session. But there is one thing at which the people of this country will feel displeased — that we should have been left for three or four days without any explanation whatever of the resignation of the late Ministry⁹ (hear, hear,)¹⁰ — no Minister of the Crown having vouchsafed to come down and explain to the house, from a sense of duty to the country, the causes which led to their resignation, while the interference of the Attorney General East has prevented the gallant Knight from giving those explanations which were due to himself and to the country. I hold that this house, by Parliamentary usage, and as a matter of right, is entitled to know what were the causes of that resignation,¹¹ and what has been done towards the formation of a new Administration, instead of being obliged to depend on the rumours which are current in the streets. We are now compelled to accept what is said outside — and what are we told? That before His Excellency accepted the resignation of the hon. and gallant Premier, he was in treaty with a member of the Legislative Council to re-organize the Administration?¹²

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH (ironically). — Hear, hear.¹³

[MR. J.S. MACDONALD continued:] Are we to hear such statements made outside in the streets, while we are to have no information given us in this house? Are we to remain till Monday, knowing nothing more about it, than that the Solicitor General has come down, desiring the house to adjourn, first from Wednesday to Friday, and then from Friday till Monday? Are we here merely to wait on the caprices of a defunct Ministry, who have lost the confidence of the country? (Hear, hear.) Are we to wait, day after day, satisfied with the Solicitor General rising up and asking us to do — only what they may choose to ask us? When we have been three months in session, and when the country is looking to us for the accomplishment of those great measures which are desired by the people, are we to be told that we are to adjourn, from day to day, without so much as an explanation being given us, whilst the members of the Government are all the time caucusing and canvassing how they are to keep their positions, after they have treated their leader in the most shameful way. Let them dare to rise up in their places¹⁴ and say that they have not caballed to exclude the Premier! That the annals of Parliament show any more shameful and treacherous plot!¹⁵ (Hear, hear.)¹⁶

MR. ROBINSON here interrupted the member for Glengary, and said the example of the gallant Knight, in not going too minutely into the circumstances which had led to the present position of affairs, should be imitated by other hon. members. (Cries of order! order!)¹⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — There must be an end to all this. The patience of this House is exhausted.¹⁸

DR. T. FORTIER. — Well done.¹⁹

[MR. J.S. MACDONALD:] The members of the administration have had their resignations accepted, and only hold office until their successors are appointed; and it was their duty, if they do not choose to come down themselves, to instruct their Solicitor General, or some member of their party, to rise up and make explanations, as has been done formerly, and to give the house some information of what has been doing [sic], so that we may not as now be asking each other on the streets what is the position of affairs. Let the reports which are abroad be either contradicted or confirmed, but do not let us be brought here and adjourned from day to day, till they choose to come down and ask us to agree to such new arrangements as they may have made. It is said we are to have a dissolution.²⁰

MR. MACKENZIE. — Good!²¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — I am prepared for that quite as well as the member for Haldimand, and the country is prepared for it. But I must say that this House has seen a surprise once before — a surprise which it has never to this day resented as it ought to have done, from a sense of its own dignity²². Two years ago, Parliament was dissolved by an unconstitutional exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, and we do not know how near we may be to another *coup d'état*²³ on the part of the Government, and be summoned on Monday by the Usher of the Black Rod to the bar of the Legislative Council, to learn there that the Parliament has been dissolved.²⁴ (Hear, hear.) It certainly will not be prevented by any sense of delicacy on the part of the Administration, who are treating us as they are now doing, after they have been voted down, after they have had the voice of this house against them. (No! no!) Are we to remain here doing nothing, till they have leisurely concocted their schemes and come to us to sanction them?²⁵ If we do, we are traitors to the rights of the people.²⁶ I appeal to this house, if it has any manly spirit, to stand up for its rights and not allow itself to be trampled on by any combination of men who choose to go out for the purpose of re-organizing themselves, and sacrificing their leader.²⁷ I ask their Conservative supporters in this House, if they are prepared to submit to this, and whether they are prepared to aid these

men in destroying their leader? I have now discharged my duty. I would say as a Canadian²⁸, as one who [has] had long experience in the Legislation of this country,²⁹ that I have never seen anything so gross as this before.³⁰ I think the thanks of the country are due to the gallant knight for his willingness to have given to-day the explanations which the country demands;³¹ and I wish those Conservatives who intend to desert him joy, after listening to what he said of his long services in their cause, and after hearing the appeal he made to those who stood within his hearing, to remember how he had stood by them in all their trials. I wish them joy. I could perceive from the clapping of hands, that it is their intention to desert him; but, perhaps, as he says, they consider him worn out in the service, and are anxious to discard him. I was prepared for some trouble of this kind, and I placed this notice on the paper on Wednesday, when I was unable to say a word in consequence of my weakness from indisposition³², for an Address to his Excellency on the state of the Province. But my friends think it would not be desirable to enter upon that wide field to-day, because it would lead to a discussion of such a state of affairs as was never known in this country before, and if this house does not protest against, and put a stop to, the system which has for some time been pursued, I do not see where our difficulties are to end.³³ I hold this notice in my hand; but I have done my duty.³⁴

MR. CHISHOLM. — (Hear, hear.)³⁵

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — Aye: the hon. member for Halton says "Hear." That hon. member is perfectly content with the existing state of things. He is quite willing to destroy his chief.³⁶

MR. CHISHOLM. — I think it would be well if the member for Glengary would give the Solicitor General an opportunity of making a statement.³⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — The Solicitor General had an opportunity, but did not avail himself of it. I shall postpone the motion for an Address to his Excellency on the state of the Province till Monday.³⁸

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — When I moved the adjournment on Wednesday last, until Friday, it will be in the recollection of the House that it appeared to be almost the unanimous wish of hon. members that the House should adjourn till Monday next. (No, no — Yes, yes.) I say that it was. I ... [felt] it my duty, in consequence of the instructions given to me, to follow them to the letter, and I moved for an adjournment until today.³⁹ When I came down here to-day, I had no idea that Sir Allan MacNab was to be present, and I was instructed to take a course which the appearance of my gallant friend prevented me from doing. I am not at liberty to say anything now, in reply either to the observations of the gallant knight or to the observations of the member for Glengary. But I am authorized to say this much more, which I should have done, but for the haste with which the member for Glengary rose. I should have added to what fell from the gallant knight,⁴⁰ that His Excellency had been pleased to accept the resignation of [the] ministry, and that he had further been pleased to send for Col. Tache, with the view of forming a new Administration⁴¹ — that Col. Tache had accepted the task, and that he had invited the co-operation of my hon. friend the late Attorney General West. I hope on Monday next the house will receive the information that a Ministry has been completely formed, and for the present I shall say no more.⁴²

MR. A. DORION. — I rise for the purpose of bearing most unprejudiced testimony to the manly course adopted by the Premier of the Government. (Cheers.)⁴³ Having opposed the most of the measures in this House, I may say without prejudice that⁴⁴ if anything is calculated to enlist the sympathies of the country, and of every hon. member of this house, it must be the conduct of that hon. gentleman to-day. (Hear, hear.)⁴⁵ The hon. and gallant knight had not only shown a due regard for the constitutional usages and requirements of his position, but also a sense of the duty he owed to his country, by coming down to that House⁴⁶, ready and prepared to offer to the country the reasons for which he and his colleagues had resigned, and I only regret that such an example which has been shown by the gallant premier, at

his age, and while yet suffering from the very severe illness which has kept him away from the house during the whole of this session, was not followed by his late colleagues, which would have prompted them to come down to the house and explain the reasons which induced them to resign.⁴⁷ (Hear, hear).⁴⁸ Not only that, but they should have been willing to come forward and by so doing prevent the hon. and gallant knight from giving those reasons. I must say it is with unbounded pleasure that I am enabled to bear this testimony to the conduct of the hon. gentleman, and to declare that he has, upon this occasion, my most cordial approval of his conduct. (Hear, hear.) And I think that he ought to have the sympathy of all those who are proud of constitutional rights, and who like to see in this house usages such as are in conformity with them followed by those who care for the opinion of public men.⁴⁹

MR. LORANGER. — While concurring with the member for Montreal, and admiring the courage of the gallant knight, who came here to give an explanation to this House, at the same time I cannot blame the other members of the Administration.⁵⁰ I think it is a long standing Parliamentary usage to give proper and sufficient time to any gentleman called upon to form a new Administration. (Hear, hear.) That right I believe has never been refused⁵¹. I think that if you look back to the parliamentary history of England, and of Canada, you will find that whenever an administration is to be formed, and a gentleman is called on by the Queen or Governor to form it, and he asks for time it is given to him.⁵²

MR. HOLTON. — How long?⁵³

MR. LORANGER. — The hon. gentleman asks how long? There is no time limited [sic]. If the hon. member will point out what length of time is necessary to form an Administration, then he may impose a limit.⁵⁴

MR. HOLTON (derisively). — Hear, hear.⁵⁵

MR. LORANGER. — The hon. gentleman may laugh if he pleases. A laugh is always the answer of any one who cannot give a better reply. (Hear, hear.) If you refuse the time necessary to form an Administration, you deny the royal prerogative to form an Administration.⁵⁶

MR. A. DORION⁵⁷ [OR] MR. BROWN. — That is not the question.⁵⁸

MR. LORANGER. — It is the question before the House. A motion is made to adjourn until Monday, to enable the gentleman who has been called on to form a Government. This is the question before the House,⁵⁹ and on the other side of the house it is contended that the motion of adjournment should not be granted because that ample time has already been given.⁶⁰

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — No.⁶¹

MR. LORANGER. — What do you want?⁶²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — Explanations.⁶³

MR. LORANGER. — What explanations do you want? Those explanations will be given when the government is formed. The Premier has said that he will defer the explanations he has to give until Monday, and is not that a proof that he considered the reason given for a delay sufficient?⁶⁴ Why should hon. gentlemen endeavor to hurry an explanation which, they are told, cannot be given?⁶⁵ As a precedent for this, I will refer to the time when the Hincks Administration resigned in 1844 [sic]. Were explanations then given before a new administration was formed?⁶⁶ (Cries of Yes, yes.)⁶⁷

A Member. — Yes; Mr. Hincks came down and stated why he resigned.⁶⁸

[MR. LORANGER] very much doubted the correctness of that assertion.⁶⁹ Those explanations were given only when the new administration was formed; but putting it as a matter of common sense,⁷⁰ can you force members of an Administration to give explanations before a Government is formed? It is nothing but a matter of right and justice to give the gentleman called on to form the new Government time to form that Government, before compelling him or any member of the late Government to give explanations. Of course I do not enter into the merits of the new administration. When they come before the house let them be tried by their acts; but I say that after eight days have been consumed in discussing a question of non-confidence, which resulted in a majority of the whole House in favour of the Government, and when a portion of them resigned, forcing the others to go with them, it is unfair to ask them to give explanations before the Government is formed, when a member of that Government comes here and says "we are not ready," and asks for one day's delay. I think during this session time enough has been wasted in vain discussions, and when a matter of so much importance comes before us, I think it is very unjust to refuse the delay asked for.⁷¹

MR. CAMERON. — I do not concur in some of the observations of the honourable member who has just sat down. We have heard that the Government was sustained by a majority of this House — and if this is the case, why should we not have explanations of the reasons which induced them to resign, of the peculiarity of the position in which they were placed. If they were sustained by a majority of the House we have a right to know what explanations the Government is prepared to give, and⁷² in what state the progress of the formation of the new administration is at this moment — (hear, hear) — because the very moment it was admitted on the floor of this house that a majority of the members of the United Provinces sustained the Government, we are not in a position in which we can be told, that no explanations are to be given upon the subject. (Hear, hear.)⁷³ It is quite clear that a large portion of the Government is gone out on a principle that a double majority is necessary to uphold a Government — a principle which I am ready to say that a large majority of the people of this Province, both of Upper and Lower Canada, will not sustain.⁷⁴ We are entitled, every one of us, to thank the honorable and gallant Knight for coming down here in his weak state of health, stating that he was ready to explain; and if, as the hon. member for Glengary says, he has been deserted by a portion of the Conservative party, I say there are plenty of the members of that party in this house⁷⁵ and plenty of Conservatives out of the House who will endorse his position. (Cheers.) He need not fear any attacks, no matter from what quarter they may come. I will not discuss the question now, but we will be ready to stand by him on this issue; no matter what may be the position in which they are going to carry on the Government of the United Provinces.⁷⁶ If an adjournment is to be had till Monday, we shall have an opportunity of seeing upon what principle the Government, after having repudiated the principle of carrying on the government of Canada as a whole, are going to act.⁷⁷

Cheers from the Conservative members.⁷⁸

MR. FELLOWES could not understand how hon. gentlemen who had helped to overthrow the late Administration, were now so eulogistic of its Premier.⁷⁹ It is owing to the hon. member for Toronto who has just spoken, and to those who act with him, and to them alone, that the Premier is in his place here to-day alone, and that the other members of the Administration are not.⁸⁰ When it is charged that the Conservatives of this house have deserted the honorable and gallant Knight, I say that the majority of those members of this house have not done so, but that he has been deserted by the hon. gentleman who last spoke. (Hear, hear.) The resignation of the ministry cannot be attributed to the desertion of a majority of the Conservative members of this house. I can see, in the explanations given by the honorable and gallant Knight, the reasons why the ministry are not here in their places. The hon. gentleman stated that he differs with them in opinion as to the reasons why they should resign, and if they are desirous to consider their opinions and to come down with them at a future day, I think that to give them time, in order

that an agreement might be come to, is nothing but reasonable.⁸¹ Much has been said by hon. gentlemen who endeavor to fraternize with the Premier because he has the courage to come down here to offer explanations, and because he has thought proper⁸² to place his resignation in the hands of his Excellency. He has the good of the country at heart, more so than hon. gentlemen who are too often wont to make use of such a position for their own advantage. (Hear, hear.) I think that the course pursued by some of the Conservative members will be well understood by the country⁸³, and when they go to the country, the country will understand how to reward men who have leagued together for their own purposes, to destroy a liberal Government which was heartily disposed to carry out liberal measures.⁸⁴

MR. GAMBLE. — I have no doubt that the country will thoroughly understand the hon. gentleman who last spoke, (hear, hear,) and it will be perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the honourable and gallant Knight, and the pe[o]ple will show it in no unmistakeable manner. I should like to know how it is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lyon) can undertake to get up here and charge hon. members with having taken a course for their own aggrandizement only.⁸⁵ Is his course so very pure that he can stand up and tax hon. gentlemen with motives? It was a most unparliamentary course, and showed that the hon. gentleman was destitute of any argument to-night or he would not have been obliged to accuse hon. gentlemen of being actuated by any such motives in the votes they had given.⁸⁶ I think the country is indebted to the hon. and gallant Knight for the position he has taken. I think they will appreciate it, and speak out as I observed in no unmistakeable manner. And with regard to the position which the hon. gentleman has taken, it is generally understood by the country. He denies the doctrine of double majorities, and I for one will sustain him in it, and he will be upheld in it by every man of common sense, and by those who appr[e]ciate the interests of Upper Canada as they ought to.⁸⁷

MR. WILSON. — To resign is one thing; to form a new Administration is another. (Hear, hear.) It was due to this house, by the hon. members who have resigned, to have come forward at once as did the hon. Premier, and explain why they did resign. If any hon. gentleman, upon behalf of any one charged with forming a new Administration, thought it his duty to come here in order to gain time for the accomplishment of this object, no doubt this house would have granted it⁸⁸ without discussion. But it is necessary to guard the rights and privileges of this House in whatever way they may deal with this question. We should show that we entertain a just appreciation of our position.⁸⁹ The hon. and gallant knight has shown that he had a just perception of what was due to the House upon such an occasion.⁹⁰ However this house may sanction the course of proceeding upon the part of those hon. gentlemen who have absented themselves from this house, I say that those hon. gentleman [sic] ought to have explained why they resigned, and have allowed the honourable Premier to explain to this house, the reasons why he was opposed to their resignation. If those hon. gentlemen had a majority of this house, (as there is no doubt they had,) what need was there of their resignation? Was it because they tried to frighten their followers into the idea that if there was not an Upper Canada majority to sustain them they would resign? Is this double majority system to be carried out? I say it ought not to be carried out, and hon. gentlemen who think that they can carry it out will find themselves mistaken. I for one have long opposed the hon. Premier, but he is well entitled to the sympathies of every member of this house, for if he has a thousand faults, he does not possess that of deserting his friends. (Great cheering.) And I wish that his late colleagues had taken upon themselves a little of his spirit in that respect.⁹¹

MR. TURCOTTE thought that the moment the ministers had resigned, they should have felt bound to take the earliest opportunity of stating their reasons. (Hear, hear.) It was quite proper to give time for the formation of a new Ministry, but that was quite a different matter from that of resigning. He objected most strongly to the principle of a double majority, and if the retiring ministers had left their posts because of the late vote, he thought they had done so upon a very frivolous reason. The hon. gentleman for Toronto had just given his opinion, and he thanked him for the liberal support he had given the Administration, as he had also done on the former adverse vote — that on the Duval case.⁹² That

hon. gentleman had then made a motion which he could not but know would embarrass the Government, and he had little doubt it was offered with the hope of defeating them.⁹³

MR. SCATCHERD. — There is no gentleman than myself more pleased to see the resignation of the Ministry, and none more regret that the hon. Premier should stand alone, than I do. I consider that if there has been anything in the late Administration which deserves the censure of the country, it has been the course of the colleagues of the hon. and gallant Knight, in forsaking him.⁹⁴ If there was anything connected with the late Administration [sic] that reflected credit upon the country, it was the fact that that hon. and gallant gentleman had been at the head of it.⁹⁵ I must say with the greatest respect, that I feel sorry that the Premier should be now in his place, and that the rest of his colleagues did not tender their resignations along with him. This is not a Government which the country required. I hope that if this house adjourns to Monday, we shall find the late Administration will adopt the honourable course which the Premier has, and tender their resignations to His Excellency.⁹⁶ (Hear, hear, and laughter.)⁹⁷

MR. ROBINSON. — I wish to explain how it was that I called the hon. member for Glengary to order.⁹⁸ I desire not to be misunderstood. I only interrupted the member for Glengarry because I thought he was going too far in accusing hon. gentlemen who were absent from their places⁹⁹ of their conduct towards the Premier¹⁰⁰; and because I thought the discussion had better be deferred until they are present, and that it would better please that hon. gentleman himself. That was the sole reason why I stopped him as I did.¹⁰¹ Let them only be in their places, and then I shall not stop any hon. gentleman.¹⁰²

MR. BROWN rose and said, hon. gentlemen will perceive that there are two separate matters which require explanation. In the first place we are entitled to receive from the members forming the late Administration explanations why they resigned, and in the second place we are entitled to hear, from time to time, what progress is being made towards the formation of a new Administration. When a Government has been organized, then we shall be entitled to further explanations as to the grounds upon which it was formed. What we complain of is that, up to this moment, no explanation whatever has been given us as to the causes of their resignation, by the members of the late Ministry. (Hear, hear.) And I do think that had they a proper regard for the rights of this house, and a right apprehension of what is due to their own position, these gentlemen would have been in their places ere this to give such explanations as were demanded from them by Parliamentary usage. And apart from the consideration of general constitutional usage, I cannot but think that there are circumstances connected with the present resignation which called specially for prompt and explicit explanations. The Premier of the late Government is in his place, and he tells us that he differed from his colleagues upon the question of their resignation; and if he states the case correctly — which I do not for a moment doubt — I am convinced that the ground taken by the gallant knight, in opposition to his colleagues, will be recognized and sustained by every member of this house, and by the country at large, as the only correct one. The Premier tells us that there are explanations yet to be given — explanations of a grave character — as to the causes of difference between him and his late colleagues, but which he cannot give until they are present. How then can it be tolerated that Ministers shall absent themselves from their places, and deny us that full information so needful for us to receive? Shall negotiations proceed for the formation of a new Ministry — shall a new Government, perhaps, be formed while these important explanations are withheld from this house? Nothing could be more censurable than such a proceeding. (Hear, hear.) May not hon. members of this house, before we meet again, be called upon to state what course they will take as to a new Administration, and how can they answer wisely unless they are aware of the whole grounds upon which the late ministry resigned? The statements made by the hon. member for Hamilton show most clearly the absolute necessity that explanation should be given, and given forthwith. And there are other grounds. This is the fifth or sixth ministerial crisis which we have had in the present parliament. (Hear, hear.) We had the crisis occasioned by the resignation of the former member for Oxford (Mr. Hincks) — the crisis brought about by the

resignation of Mr. Morin — the crisis of the Hon. John Ross — the Duval crisis — and half a dozen other crises in which members of the ministry threatened to go out, but got their price and staid in. (Hear, hear.) Under our constitutional system, a ministerial resignation is always held [to be] of the gravest importance. The gentlemen composing the late ministry seem to have come to the conclusion that they are the permanent proprietors of the Treasury benches — that when they get beaten, all that is necessary is to make a nominal resignation, shuffle a pack, and construct again. They seem to think they can by finesse, keep the Government of the country in their hands for ever¹⁰³, and manage the government without any respect to the opinion of this House at all.¹⁰⁴ There is another peculiarity about this case. Why is it that every member of the late administration is now out of his seat? (Hear, hear.) Not one of them [is] present. Is it not evident that the whole thing is a mere shuffling of the cards? — (hear, hear)¹⁰⁵ — or rather a shuffle of one card, for it would seem that they are to have the same men back again who have lost the confidence of this house¹⁰⁶ — and is not every hon. member in this house concluding in his mind that this is but the conclusion of a game that has been going on for months — a scheme to eject the hon. and gallant Knight from his seat, and put another ruler in his place? (Cheers.) Does not every one now feel that the statements of disgraceful caballings within the Cabinet Chamber, which circulated so freely for many weeks, were true, and that this delay of public business — all this mockery of resignation, is a mere manœuvre of the conspirators to get rid of the gallant Knight? (Loud cheers.) And if that is the conclusion to be arrived at — if all this delay is but to produce the exchange of Col. Tache for the gallant Knight — then, I am sure I speak the feelings of every hon. member who voted non-confidence in the Administration, when I say that such a change will by no means meet the difficulty. (Hear, hear.) And I am sure I speak at least the sentiments of the Opposition when I say that if there was any one member of the late Government, who, [more] than all his colleagues possessed their personal respect, it was the honourable and gallant member for Hamilton. (Cheers.) It is true that we differ from that hon. gentleman in political opinions — it is true that we cannot but condemn the course pursued by that hon. gentleman's administration. But we do not overlook the fact that the hon. gentleman was on a bed of sickness while the worst deeds of that Administration were being enacted here. (Cheers.) It must be clear to everybody that the intention of the hon. gentlemen who are not in their seats is, as I have said, to make a mere shuffling of the cards. And will this house be satisfied with that? Will this restore the confidence that was lost? What will the turning out of Sir Allan effect? Why were the late Ministers condemned? Was it because Sir Allan MacNab was Premier and Col. Tache was not? No; it was because, on the great public questions before the house and the country, the policy of the Ministry was not satisfactory. (Cheers.) *That* was the reason of their condemnation. We felt that their policy and their measures were not such as the country would endorse. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, will the ejection of the gallant Knight cause any change in that policy, or those measures? Will Col. Tache abandon a permanent seat of Government at Quebec — the North Shore Railroad, and Sectarian Schools — or will he give us Representation by Population? Shall eleven of the twelve Ministers eat up all they have said in the last few months? And supposing Col. Tache and his colleagues were to come down here to-day and state that they had changed their position and their principles, and were willing to give us all we demanded, what a demoralizing spectacle would be presented to the world! (Hear, hear.) Could we trust them, even then, to carry out our views? If they now declare that they resigned office, because of our declaration that we have no confidence in them, how, I ask, can [they] for a moment expect to regain that confidence by bringing us down the very same set of men? (Hear, hear.) We may be accused of committing a breach of constitutional usage in debating these points now; but I submit that we have been forced to it by the conduct of the administration, in failing to come down to the house and give us those prompt and candid explanations which we were entitled to receive at their hands. Hon. gentlemen, it appears to me, do not sufficiently estimate the importance of these explanations, which we insist upon. Suppose for a moment that a new ministry should be formed, and that the first thing we heard after its announcement was the rap of the Usher of the Upper House, calling us to the bar of the Council, to be instantly prorogued and sent back to our constituents (hear, hear); with what knowledge should we go to our counties? (Hear, hear.) Sir, it

is our right as the representatives of the people, to have been informed at the very earliest moment [of] the whole grounds upon which the Ministry resigned, and the steps taken towards forming a new Administration. To show the necessity of this — let us imagine that we had received full explanations — that the reasons given were not satisfactory to us on constitutional grounds — would it not have been competent for this house to have addressed his Excellency the Governor General, declaring its views upon the constitutional issue raised, and the reasons why it differed from the retiring Administration? (Hear, hear.) And if in addition to these explanations we had been told that his Excellency had charged Col. Tache with the formation of a new Administration, and we disapproved of that gentleman being placed at the head of public affairs, I ask if it would not have been competent for this house to have stated its objections to the Governor General? (Cheers.) I say, then, Sir, that the Government had no right to deprive us of those constitutional privileges which this house is entitled to enjoy. (Cheers.) And we are now asked to adjourn over to Monday, to permit an interregnum of [an]other three days in the face of the statement by the hon. Premier, that he differed from his colleagues — knows nothing at all about what is going on, except that he placed his resignation in the hands of the Governor General, and knows not whether his Excellency accepted it or not.¹⁰⁷

MR. FELTON. — It was accepted.¹⁰⁸

MR. BROWN. — Do I understand the Premier to say “yes.”¹⁰⁹

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB. — I should prefer saying nothing more. I stated as distinctly as I could the position that I stand in, and hon. gentlemen could not misunderstand me.¹¹⁰ He would state his position again on Monday.¹¹¹

MR. BROWN. — The course pursued by the hon. and gallant Knight, is one which does him honor (cheers), but I think that that taken by the Administration in regard to this house, is very much to be censured. Those hon. gentlemen should have known that the hon. Premier would be in his seat to-day if it were possible, and whether or no, they should have been prepared to give the fullest explanations what course the hon. gentlemen who are not in their seats intend taking. We can as yet only surmise — but I am persuaded that if they fancy they will carry the people of Upper Canada, or their representatives more easily with them, because they have ejected the hon. member for Hamilton and replaced him by the hon. Col. Tache — a greater mistake was never made by any body of men in this or any other country. (Hear, hear.) Speaking as a member of the Reform party and with a good knowledge of the popular feeling of Upper Canada, I have no hesitation in saying that of all the members of the late Administration the hon. and gallant Knight is the only one whose influence in the country they have the slightest cause to fear — that he was the only man among them who carried any weight among the masses at the polls. (Hear, hear.)¹¹² Is this the way to strengthen their party? They may get strength in the House, but they will not get strength in the country.¹¹³ I would like the Solicitor General (Mr. Smith) to carry back to his colleagues the views of this house so forcibly expressed upon this occasion. I trust he will not fail to let them understand, that unless greater deference is paid to the feelings of the people of Upper Canada, as expressed in this house during the late debate — unless the Government come prepared to meet us upon the great questions at issue in a very different spirit, — the vote given in this house on Tuesday night will be repeated again without an hour's hesitation. (Cheers.)¹¹⁴

MR. ALLEYN expressed his regret that the members of the Administration had not thought fit to come down to this House and explain the causes of their resignation; (Loud cries of hear, hear)¹¹⁵. If any additional reason were wanted to show the unfair conduct of the late Administration in acting thus, it was supplied by the conduct of their hon. and gallant leader in coming down to that House prepared to enter into his explanations, although in such an enfeebled state that he had to be carried in. (Hear, hear.)¹¹⁶ He confessed that when the late ministry was formed, he had not much confidence in it, especially

in the Tory portion of it, but his confidence in the late Premier had increased from day to day. He did not think the ministry should have resigned, when they had a majority of 23 in a house of 120 members present, and he must express his regret, his deep regret that the members of the late Administration¹¹⁷ had not appeared before the House this afternoon to give a full and satisfactory explanation of the course they have deemed it necessary to pursue. (Hear, hear.)¹¹⁸ If the principle on which the Administration had now resigned were recognised, he thought they ought to have resigned before. But he hoped sincerely, such a principle would never be recognized.¹¹⁹ There was one point on which he would take the liberty of differing from the gallant Knight, when he said he feared he was fit for little else but private life. He trusted he had yet before him some eight or nine years of useful public life.¹²⁰

MR. EVANTUREL was happy in concurring for once with the hon. member for Lambton. He expressed his regret as others had done, that the retiring ministers were not here to explain the cause of their resignation as these causes would weigh in the forming of the new Administration. He did not agree with the statements of the member for Quebec, who had not cordially assented to the formation of the Coalition, for he believed that the interests of Lower Canada were safer in the hands of the Conservatives of Upper Canada than in those of any other class. He had admired the course of the hon. member for Hamilton, and hoped that he would yet occupy a prominent place in the Legislature.¹²¹

MR. FELTON did not think the members of the Administration ought to be blamed for not hurrying down with an explanation; and the hon. members opposite should have refrained from censuring them in their absence.¹²²

MR. WILSON. — Why are they not here?¹²³

[MR. FELTON continued:] He thought it ought not to be lost sight of that the Ministry had not forfeited the confidence of their Lower Canadian supporters, and that on the vote in question the Government had been [sic] sustained by a large majority of the representatives of the people from Lower Canada.¹²⁴ The resignation of the Ministry had been on the double majority principle, because they had lost the confidence of the people of Upper Canada, and it might have been expected, therefore, that the Lower Canada portion of the Administration would return to office.¹²⁵ This, if no other reason existed, was sufficient to warrant the retiring ministers in taking such time as might be indispensably necessary to enable them to determine upon the course which should be pursued.¹²⁶ And an explanation of the whole circumstances could best be given when the new Administration was formed.¹²⁷ He considered the Government perfectly right in tendering their resignations, under the circumstances attending the vote of Wednesday. With respect to the reference made during this debate to the system of double majorities, he did not recognize any very strong argument against it; indeed, the constituencies of Lower Canada would never consent to be ruled by force of a preponderance of representation from the Upper Canadian section of the province. (Hear, hear.)¹²⁸ He therefore hoped that no opposition would be offered to an adjournment.¹²⁹

MR. PATRICK thinks that the course pursued by the Premier is one that must commend itself to him and every member of the House. He had opposed that gallant knight for a long time, but the course which he has now taken is one that must meet with the sympathies of every hon. member.¹³⁰ [He] had always experienced the utmost horror at the way in which that hon. gentleman had been treated by his colleagues.¹³¹ [He] congratulated the late Ministry on having in their absence such a defender as the hon. gentleman who had just spoken.¹³² He had listened with some surprise to the member for Russell — that hon. gentleman had lectured his Conservative friends, for their inconsistency, and from that fact he supposes that hon. gentleman is now a conservative. He had twice been elected as a Reformer¹³³ — now, however, he turned out to be a full-blown Conservative, (hear, hear). It was only some eight or ten days ago, since that hon. gentleman had indignantly denounced the government; and again, a day or two after,

the hon. gentleman became Conservative and defended the government (hear, hear, and laughter). And if rumor was correct, the hon. gentleman had very good reason indeed, for doing so. With respect to the person who had been named as the head of the new administration, he had fully concurred in what seemed to be the general opinion of the House, that that hon. gentleman would inspire no confidence in any Administration, (hear, hear). The speeches and actions of that hon. gentleman had excited the greatest possible indignation in the breast of every right-minded man in the Upper Province (hear, hear.)¹³³

MR. BELLINGHAM said that he concurred in the opinion that the double majority principle is one which ought not to obtain. But still it is evident that the force of public opinion in Upper Canada, influenced and directed by a press far superior to that of Lower Canada is so great that no government can exist which does not pay close attention to it.¹³⁵ And it should be borne in mind that at present the population of Upper Canada was in excess of that of Lower Canada by 250,000, who were unrepresented in this house, and the day must soon come when they would be represented.¹³⁶ There could be no doubt about it, but that the duty of the Administration was to have come down to the House that day and informed them why they had thought proper to resign (hear).¹³⁷

MR. S. SMITH said — I wish to make an acknowledgement of error to the Solicitor General West for having stated the other night that I believed the Administration would not resign. I acknowledge that I laboured under a false impression.¹³⁸ (Laughter.)¹³⁹ But I rise chiefly for the purpose of expressing my hearty and real feeling of pleasure at the course taken by the gallant knight, in appearing in his place to-day, prepared to give his explanations. I am satisfied that not only this house but the country will sustain him in the course he has pursued in that respect. There are certain members of this house who think that the late member for Renfrew, now Governor of Barbadoes, was probably the worst man that Canada ever saw, that he did things with a high hand, that he was self-willed, and all that sort of thing.¹⁴⁰

Hear, hear, from MR. MACKENZIE¹⁴¹.

[MR. S. SMITH continued:] But ... no hon. gentleman would assert that Mr. Hincks would have taken such a high-handed step as had been taken by the absent members of the late Administration. That hon. gentleman would never have resigned his office, refused to tender his reasons for doing so, while at the same time, he put his hands in his pockets and walked away, leaving the House to find out the information as best they might. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴² And any Administration which thinks it can deal with the house and the country in that way will find itself very much mistaken. It will be remembered that when the Hincks-Morin Administration was broken up in September 1854, the resignation took place in the morning, and the explanation was given in the house on the afternoon of the same day. He [Mr. Hincks] did not think it necessary to keep the house and the country waiting for three or four days for his explanation. It is true Mr. Hincks did not stand in the same position as those hon. gentlemen. For, although they have resigned, they step back into their old places, and as soon as they got rid of their gallant leader, it was all right. So they think they can give all at once, both the reasons why they went out, and the reasons why they come in again, and I do verily believe that their reasons for going out are exactly their reasons for staying in. (Hear, hear.) The Solicitor General West¹⁴³ informed ... [the House] that His Excellency had seen fit to send for a Lower Canadian gentleman (hon. Mr. Tache) to form an administration. Now he [Mr. Smith] had no more objection to the Premier being a Lower Canadian than he had to his being an Upper Canadian, but he would say that in his humble opinion (and without meaning any disrespect thereby), His Excellency had erred in looking to an irresponsible body for the formation of an administration, — more especially so, when an act had been passed making the Legislative Council — of which the hon. gentleman said to be sent for, was a member — elective; thus declaring that that body did not possess the confidence of the people of the country. (Hear, hear). If that House was right in passing that bill, there, most decidedly — and he wished to say so with due respect — His Excellency must be wrong in sending for a member of that House to form an administration. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁴ One thing more I have

to say. The gentlemen, who used to occupy the Treasury Benches, and who, I suppose, will occupy them again, will be most grievously mistaken if they fancy that by a mere shuffle of a card — not of the pack, but of one card, shuffling the gallant Knight out, and shuffling another into his place — if they fancy that by that they are going to regain the confidence of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) It was not a mere desire on the part of the people to get rid of the gallant Knight that led to the strong feeling which prevailed in the country [sic], and which forced the members of this house to take up positions antagonistic to the late Government. (Hear, hear.) It was a strong feeling of indignation at the course and measures of the Administration,¹⁴⁵ (hear, hear,)¹⁴⁶ and one of them in particular; the bringing down an appropriation to this house for the location of the permanent Seat of Government for Canada, in Quebec. Will these gentlemen now be prepared to repudiate that, or to repudiate the North Shore Railway? Are they prepared to allow a census to be taken, that something may be ascertained in regard to Representation by Population? Or are we to have the same gentlemen, and the same policy that we had before? (Hear, hear.) Are we to swallow all their old measures, simply because the gallant Knight has been thrust out of his place, and some one else put in? I did not oppose the Administration on account of its *personnel* [sic], but on account of its measures, and I am not prepared, on account of the removal of one of their number, to vote confidence in men, in whom, only on Tuesday last, I voted that I had no confidence. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁷ The hon. gentleman than [sic] referred to the rumor that the hon. Mr. Ross was going to accept office again, and said that he, for one, could not believe a report so derogatory to the character of that hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁸

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS said he had come into the House sometime after the debate had begun, and found in the hands of the Speaker a motion to adjourn¹⁴⁹, and the burden of the debate is that Ministers are not in their places to give their reasons for resigning.¹⁵⁰

A Member. — Why did you not bring them with you?¹⁵¹

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS proceeded. — I acquiesce in the principle that Ministers should be prepared to give reasons for their resignation at the earliest possible moment. But, instead of coming here to-day, they ask for an adjournment till Monday. And on Monday what will they state? First, the reasons why they resigned, and secondly the reasons why they were not prepared to be here to explain. (Laughter.) Hon. members may laugh. It is customary for the Opposition to laugh, when they can do nothing else. But I appeal to the good sense of this house, whether they should condemn hon. gentlemen in their absence, whether they should not be content to wait for explanations till Monday. Hon. gentlemen know there are differences between the Premier and his colleagues¹⁵² — moreover the resignation of the ministry has occurred under peculiar, anomalous circumstances; that is, there being a large majority of the whole House in their favour; but it is considered by some that the Upper Canada section of the Cabinet is in a constitutional minority.¹⁵³ And there are other difficulties of which hon. gentlemen have no conception. (Laughter.) It is the most reasonable and just course to wait till Monday, when the Administration will give such full explanations as will satisfy the house in regard to their conduct.¹⁵⁴

MR. RANKIN said the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. S. Smith) had so fully anticipated the substance of the remarks which he (Mr. R.) intended to have made, it would not be necessary to detain the House.¹⁵⁵ The hon. Sir Allan MacNab had only acted a consistent upright part in coming down to the House as he had done on that occasion. That conduct was expected of him. But he would also say, that the conduct of his late colleagues was just what was to be expected of them. (Hear and laughter.)¹⁵⁶ He could give a full explanation of the proceedings of the absent members of the government since the late adverse vote. (Laughter, and cries of "explain").¹⁵⁷ But he would defer doing so till they appeared in their places on Monday. He also congratulated himself on the correctness of his judgment when he declared some time ago that the most base, unworthy, and abominable treachery was being practised against the gallant Knight day by day, by some of his colleagues, who scrupled at no means to hurl him

from his place.¹⁵⁸ [They] had been all along intriguing to supplant each other, and to use the administrative advantages within their control, towards their own personal and political advancement. (Hear, hear.)¹⁵⁹ Neither the House nor the country would allow those hon. gentlemen to resume the seats they had so long disgraced.¹⁶⁰

The House then adjourned¹⁶¹.

(541) | Then, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Robinson*,
The House adjourned until Monday next.¹⁶²

Footnotes

1. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856, reports that "the Speaker took the chair about 25 minutes to four o'clock, and the doors being immediately opened, there was quite a rush to the galleries, the front seats of which were speedily filled with ladies. There was a large attendance of gentlemen present also, in the hope of some ministerial explanation." In a commentary, *Globe*, 24 May 1856, reports that "the House of Assembly, at three o'clock yesterday, contained a very large number of anxious individuals, eager for information as to the actual position of the ministry. The galleries were crowded, and almost every seat in the House was filled, save these which ministers usually occupy. At a quarter past three o'clock, when the Speaker took the chair, the members of the Cabinet were still absent — Mr. Solicitor General Smith alone appearing on behalf of the Government." In its account of the debate, this newspaper reports that "the Speaker took the chair at half-past three."
2. *Globe*, 24 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856, specifies that Sir A. MacNab was "carried into the House by two of his servants, amidst the cheering of the opposition benches." According to the same source, this occurred during the presentation of petitions. *Globe*, 24 May 1856, reports similar information.
3. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856, reports that Mr. Chabot also "moved that the rules of the House in reference to that petition be suspended, in order that it might be referred to the same committee charged with other petitions and references connected with the same subject". It also mentions that the petition was presented "on behalf of John Maguire".
4. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
6. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
7. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856, reports that "Sir A. McNab was very warmly applauded at several portions of his address and at the close."
8. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
9. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
11. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
12. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
15. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
16. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
17. *Globe*, 24 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856, reports that this member "rose to say a few words to the member for Glengary; but was wholly inaudible, though he continued speaking for some time, from the cries of 'order,' 'sit down.' " *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856, also comments that "the noise was such as to prevent his remarks being heard".
18. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
23. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.

24. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
25. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
26. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
27. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
28. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
30. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
31. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
32. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
33. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
34. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
39. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
40. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
42. *Globe*, 24 May 1856. In a commentary, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856, reports that "this announcement was received with ironical cheers".
43. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
44. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
45. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
46. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
47. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
48. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
49. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
50. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
51. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
52. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
58. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
59. *Ibid.*
60. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
61. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
62. *Ibid.*
63. *Ibid.*
64. *Ibid.*
65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
66. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
67. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
68. *Globe*, 24 May 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856, reports that Mr. Loranger's statement "was contradicted by several members."
69. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
70. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
71. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
74. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
75. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
76. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
77. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.

78. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
79. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
80. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
81. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
82. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
83. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
84. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
85. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
86. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
87. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
91. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
92. *Ibid.*
93. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
94. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
95. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
96. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
97. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
98. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
99. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
100. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
101. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
102. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
103. *Ibid.*
104. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
105. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
106. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
107. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
108. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
109. *Ibid.*
110. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
111. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
112. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
113. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
114. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
115. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
116. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
117. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
118. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
119. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
120. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
121. *Ibid.*
122. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
123. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
124. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
125. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
126. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
127. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
128. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
129. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
130. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
131. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
132. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
133. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.

134. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
135. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
136. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
137. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
138. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
139. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
140. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
141. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
142. *Ibid.*
143. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
144. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
145. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
146. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
147. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
148. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
149. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
150. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
151. *Ibid.*
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
154. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
155. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
156. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
157. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
158. *Globe*, 24 May 1856.
159. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856.
160. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856.
161. *Morning Chronicle*, 28 May 1856. Commentaries on the debate of this day and on the resignation of the Administration are reported in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 23, 24, and 26 May 1856, *Globe*, 24 May 1856, *Perth Courier*, 30 May 1856, and *Western Planet*, 2 June 1856. *Niagara Mail*, 28 May 1856, reports a commentary recalling the events that occurred in the House from 15 May 1856 up to the resignation of the Administration.
162. *Globe*, 24 May 1856, and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 24 May 1856, both report that the House adjourned at half past five o'clock in the afternoon.

MONDAY, 26 MAY 1856¹

(541)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Prévost*, — The Petition of *William Campbell* and others, of the Parish of *Lacorne*; the Petition of the Reverend *M. Brunet* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jérôme*; two Petitions of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Jérôme*; two Petitions of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Adèle*; two Petitions of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Sauveur*; the Petition of the Reverend *J.B. Lemonde* and others, of the Parish of *St. Sauveur*; two Petitions of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Janvier*; the Petition of the Reverend *L.R. Fournier* and others, of the Parish of *Ste. Adèle*; two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of *Terrebonne*; two Petitions of the Municipality of the Parish of *Lacorne*; the Petition of *Joseph Longpré* and others, of the County of *Two Mountains*; the Petition of *Joseph Giroux* and others, of *Ste. Agathe*; the Petition of *Patrick Whelan* and others, of the Counties of *Argenteuil* and *Two Mountains*; the Petition of *Thomas Conroy* and others, of the Parish of *Ste. Jérôme* [sic]; the Petition of *A.R. Miller* and others, of the Parish of *St. Columban*; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Morin West*; the Petition of the Municipal Council of the Western part of *St. Jérôme*; the Petition of the Municipal Council of *Mille-Isles*; the Petition of the Municipality of the Village of *Ste. Thérèse de Blainville*; the Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Thérèse de Blainville*; the Petition of the Municipality of the Eastern part of the Township of *Abercrombie*; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Anne des Plaines*.

(542)

By Mr. *Darche*, — The Petition of *Magloire Dussaut* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jean Baptiste de Rouville*; and the Petition of *Nicolas Brouillet* and others, of the Parish of *St. Mathias*.

By Mr. *Mongenais*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Magdelaine de Rigaud*.

By Mr. *Jean Baptiste Daoust*, — The Petition of *John Burke*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. Columban*; and the Petition of *Robert Simpson*, Mayor, and others, of the County of *Argenteuil*.

By the Honorable Mr. *Cauchon*, — The Petition of *François Lepine* and others, of *La Côte de Beupré*.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*,

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out a new Writ for the Election of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Town of *Niagara*, in the room of the Honorable *Joseph Curran Morrison*, who, since his Election for the said Town, hath accepted the Office of Receiver General of this Province.

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out a new Writ for the Election of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of *Stanstead*, in the room of the Honorable *Timothy Lee Terrill*, who, since his Election for the said County, hath accepted the Office of Secretary and Registrar of this Province.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of *Pierre Doray* and others, of *Laprairie*; praying that no further guarantee may be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Of *L'Institut Canadien des Artisans de Ste. Scholastique*; praying for aid.

Of *William Robertson* and others, of the County of *Argenteuil*; praying that a District Court may be established in *Ste. Scholastique*.

Of *Richard Monck* and others, Bailiffs of Division Courts in *Upper Canada*; praying that the Tariff of Fees allowed them may be increased.

Of the Reverend *James Smith* and others, of the Township of *Ramsay*; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.

Of the Reverend *James Smith* and others, of the Township of *Ramsay*; of *Hugh Crea* and others, of the Town of *Port Hope*; of *James Murray* and others, of the Town of *Middleville*; of *Peter Grieve* and others, of the Township of *Arthur*; of *William Heron* and others, of *Ashburn*; of *Peter Robertson* and others, of the Township of *Thurlow*; of *William Moorhouse* and others, of the Township of *Lanark*; and of *Holmes Mair* and others, of the Township of *Lanark*; praying that representation may be based on population.

Of *Oscar Barcelo*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *Ste. Scholastique*; of the Reverend *F. Bourgeault* and others, of the Parish of *St. Joseph*, County of *Two Mountains*; of *Casimir Leroux* and others, of the Parish of *St. Placide*; of the Reverend *P. Poulin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Hermas*; of *D. Dupraz*, Mayor, and others, of the Village of *Ste. Scholastique*; and of the Municipal Council of the County of *Two Mountains*; praying that the Village of *Ste. Scholastique* may be made the chief place of the Judicial District of *Terrebonne*.

Of *H. Cartier* and others, Members of the Municipality of the Village and Parish of *Vaudreuil*; and of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Jeanne de L'Isle Perrot*; praying that the Counties of *Vaudreuil* and *Soulanges* may be erected into a Judicial District.

(543)

Of *Joseph Mongrain* and others; praying for an Elective Legislative Council, an Elective Governor, and the recall of Sir *Edmund Head*.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Jean Baptiste de L'Isle Verte*; praying aid for a road.

Of *J. Dorion* and others, of the Parish of *St. Ours*, County of *Richelieu*; and of *Jean Baptiste Langevin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jacques LeMineur*; praying for the abolition of Tithes, and that a fixed annual stipend may be allowed to the *Curés*.

Of the Town Council of the Town of *Brantford*; praying that the Bill to incorporate the *Norfolk, Brant, and Wentworth* Railway Company may become law.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Pierre de Sorel*; and of the Town Council of the Town of *William Henry*; praying that the Town of *William Henry* may be made the chief place of the Judicial District of *St. Hyacinthe*.

Of *James Vollar*, late a Messenger of the Legislative Assembly; praying for a pension in consideration of his long services.

Of *F.C. Capreol*, on behalf of the Metropolitan Gas and Water Company of *Toronto*; praying for certain amendments to their Act of Incorporation.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. André*; praying aid for the construction of a wharf in the said Parish.

Of *Damase Daignault* and others, of the Parish of *Chambly*; praying for the abolition of Tithes.

Of *Richard Wilson* and others, of the Township of *Euphemia*; praying that the Townships of *Euphemia*, *Dawn*, and *Sombra* may not be annexed to the County of *Kent*.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of *Richelieu*; praying that the Counties of *Richelieu*, *Berthier*, and *Yamaska*, and the Parishes of *Contrecoeur* and *St. Antoine*, in the County of *Verchères*, may be erected into a Judiciary District, and that the Town of *Sorel* may be made the chief place thereof.

Of *Andrew Buckham* and others, of the United Counties of *York* and *Peel*; praying for certain amendments to the Act providing for the payment of Petit Jurors.

Of the Honorable *G.R.S. de Beaujeu*, of *Coteau du Lac*; praying that a clause may be inserted in the Bill for transferring to one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary's of State the property now vested in the Principal Officers of Her Majesty's Ordnance, reserving and preserving to him his just right to certain property at *Coteau du Lac*, *Cedars*, and *Cascades*.

SIR A. MACNAB said — Mr. Speaker, my late colleagues in the Administration being now in their places, it becomes my duty again to address this house, and to offer to this house and to the country the reasons which have induced the members of the late Government to retire from the situations which they severally held in the Government. Immediately after the vote was taken on the motion of want of confidence in the Government in this house, the Government of this country perceived that they were

in a minority of six, so far as regards the Upper Canada representatives; they felt it their duty immediately to assemble, and when the members of that Government assembled they took into consideration what was considered by some of them a very grave and important question. The Postmaster General stated that as he came into the Government as one of two [gentlemen] representing the Reform section of the Coalition Government, and feeling that he had been deserted on that vote by a large number of those gentlemen who had given him to understand when he entered the Government that he had their confidence, and expected their support, being in a minority of votes in Upper Canada, he felt it his duty under such circumstances to resign the office he held. He felt that he could no longer maintain that degree of confidence which was necessary to him to discharge his public duty, and to remain a member of the Government. The Hon. Mr. Morrison, who came into the Government at a later period, felt that he came into the Government to replace the late Speaker of the Legislative Council who had retired, and who was one of the gentlemen that represented the reform party. He also felt that he also must follow the example that was set by his senior the Postmaster General. Attorney General McDonald expressed his conviction that having been left in a minority of six in Upper Canada, the government of the country could not be carried on with that degree of vigour necessary, considering the great questions before the country, and he felt it necessary to follow the two other gentlemen before him, and tendered his resignation. The Inspector General also tendered his resignation, but his resignation having been placed in my hands in writing, and having been returned to me by the Governor General after he had read it, I think I cannot do better than read the letter to the house: —

BEVERL[E]Y STREET, 21st May.

DEAR SIR, — The division of last night exhibited a vote adverse to the Administration, as far as Upper Canada is concerned. I am against the principle of double or sectional majorities; but I apprehend that the vote of last evening will be followed by further defection, tending to impair the usefulness of the Upper Canada section of the Cabinet, and to deprive the Government as a whole of that vigour which is essential to the efficient conduct of public affairs. Had an absolute majority been obtained against the Government, I should have been prepared to join in a request to his Excellency to be permitted to appeal to the country. As it is, I concur in the propriety of the course taken by our Upper Canada colleagues, and place my resignation in your hands, to enable his Excellency to reconstruct his Cabinet.

I remain yours faithfully,

W. CAYLEY.

SIR A. MACNAB, &c., &c., &c.

Now, that letter requires no remark at my hands. My Lower Canada colleagues disagreed with my Upper Canada colleagues, so far as regards the principle that an adverse vote of a majority of one section of the Province should involve the resignation of gentleman [sic] representing that section of the Province. I also differed. It was my misfortune to differ with them. I said, as I say now, that we have but one Parliament to govern this great country; and by our constitution and by the Union Act it is by a majority of the votes of this house that we carry our money votes, or our bills. I do not admit that a Government with a majority of twenty-three is bound to resign, because three gentleman [sic] may think proper to walk over from this side of the house to that and make a sectional majority of six. I consider that we owe to our constituents, and to the Representative of her gracious Majesty who placed us in the high position that we held lately, to remain there as long as we have a working majority. I think that 23 is a good working majority; and I think we had no right to anticipate defeat. I am not the man to meet trouble half way.² In taking the position of a responsible minister of the Crown, I resolved to persevere in my course until I was fairly turned out by a vote of this House, and which was not the case when we had 23 of a majority. His Excellency asked me if I was prepared to fill up the vacancies of those gentlemen. I said no, — not in this House.³ My Lower Canada colleagues were averse to a dissolution. I cannot say that my Upper Canada colleagues were in favor of it. They can speak for themselves. But I would say this, that I could not tender my resignation and identify myself with the reasons given by my late colleagues for resigning. But I said⁴ to His Excellency the Governor,⁵ that if in the re-construction of

the government, you may find it necessary to use the position that I held in the government, your Excellency will exercise your own discretion. Taking it for granted that his Excellency would exercise his own discretion, I placed my department in his hands, and the only reason⁶ why I withheld my resignation was that I did not think there were sufficient reasons why I should retire. I have nothing further to say but to express my deep sense of personal kindness, which, during the period of my service I have ever received at the hands of His Excellency. It is only necessary for me to make this statement, as I have no doubt I will have to address the House again before the adjournment. I have endeavored to be as concise as possible in stating what transpired up to the time I left my colleagues in the Council⁷, and to leave the matter where it was when I last addressed the house upon the[ir] resignation⁸.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — My hon. and learned friend from Hamilton, in the statement that he made of the reasons which led to the resignation of the members of the late government, and their acceptance by the Governor General, is perfectly correct so far as I can state. The Postmaster General felt that, in coming into a coalition government, he came in bringing certain support with him. Certain gentlemen belonging to the Reform party offered their support to him, and to the late Speaker of the Legislative Council, who, with him, had the confidence of the Reform party. On the vote that took place the other night, on the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal, the government, although they have a working majority of 23, were left in a minority of 6 in Upper Canada.⁹ The position in which the Postmaster General felt himself in, as a member of the Government — seeing that those gentlemen who had formerly supported the Government had withdrawn themselves — was such as greatly to prejudice his usefulness, and he could not ensure the Government that support which was one of the conditions on which he joined the administration.¹⁰ He did not, as I understand, assume the constitutionality of a double majority in the abstract. He did not put his resignation on that ground at all. The hon. Mr. Morrison retired for the reasons stated by the Postmaster General. Now these two gentlemen have made up their minds to retire in a certain event. I may say that the Postmaster General had informed me, before the house, that he would, in case of being left in an Upper Canada minority on that vote, resign. On that hon. gentleman informing me of his situation, it became my duty to consider well what course I should adopt. I did not and I do not think that the double majority system should be adopted as a rule. I feel as the gallant member for Hamilton stated, that so long as we are one Province and one Parliament, the fact of a measure being carried by a working majority is sufficient evidence that the government of the day is empowered to conduct the affairs of the country; but I could not disguise from myself that it was not a vote on a measure, but a distinct vote of confidence or want of confidence, and there having been an adverse vote against us from Upper Canada expressing want of confidence in the government, I felt that it was a sufficient indication that the measures of the government would be met with the opposition of those hon. gentlemen who have by their solemn vote withdrawn their confidence from the government. I felt also, that without the aid of those gentlemen representing the Reform party in Upper Canada, that no government, as parties are now constituted in Canada, could successfully go on; and that the withdrawal of the Postmaster General and Mr. Morrison would break up the government. If those gentlemen retired they would of course take with them the whole Reform party of the house. It would therefore be useless to attempt to go on if those gentlemen retired. I felt also this, and I so expressed myself, that though the double majority system was in the abstract indefensible,¹¹ yet no Government could long go on governing one section by the majorities drawn from the other¹²; that a continuation of that system would destroy any government. And I also stated that it was one of the strongest arguments used by the opposition against the government, that, in the present government, Upper Canada interests had been sacrificed to Lower Canada interests; and that, in fact, Lower Canada was the governing power in the administration.¹³ How much more plausible and powerful would that argument become if Upper Canada support was withdrawn? [I] ... felt that [this] would be an argument which could not be met, and that the destruction of the Government was only a question of time.¹⁴ [I] therefore followed the example of the Postmaster General,¹⁵ and the Inspector General followed in the manner stated by the late

Premier. Under these circumstances the government was at an end, and his Excellency, in the exercise of the Royal prerogative, and acting on his high responsibility, sent for the Speaker of the Legislative Council to form a government. That gentleman accepted the task, and he asked me to join him in forming a government. I also accepted the task. I saw my friends who were in the late government. I saw the Postmaster General, Mr. Morrison, and the Solicitor General West, who had also handed in his resignation with the others, and they all accepted on condition of being able to get sufficient support. After well considering what support we could get, and what support would be looked for, I suggested the name of Mr. Vankoughnet, a gentleman who is well known in Toronto¹⁶ —

Cheers ... [from the] Opposition¹⁷.

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD continued:] — and who, wherever he is known, I may say is respected and esteemed. I thought that if we secured the aid of Mr. Vankoughnet in this house, the government would receive the aid of a gentleman of great ability and unstained honor, of great acquirements in every way; who is well thought of by the Conservative party — of which, like myself, he is a member, and who as a private individual never having engaged in political strife, is not obnoxious to any party.¹⁸ (Hear, hear.)¹⁹ Under these circumstances, Mr. Vankoughnet was asked to join the government, and after some consideration he consented to do so. I regret that the late Attorney General East²⁰, who was absent to-day from indisposition, had not felt disposed to join the Ministry.²¹ With the consent of the house, I think it would be fair to that gentleman that he should be allowed to make his own explanation, when he will be in his place, in a day or two. He is now suffering from a temporary attack of illness. I do not know that I have anything more to say at present. These are simply statements of facts; that the Governor General, as the representative of her Majesty, on the late government being broken up, asked for the aid of Col. Tache, and the reason why that gentleman was called on to form a government was simply this — that he held in the late government the second position, that Sir Allan McNab was Premier and the Receiver General was second in position, and that the vote of the other night proved conclusively that the late government had the confidence of a majority of the house, and therefore, acting on a constitutional rule that the individual possessing the confidence of the house on the breaking up of any government should be sent for, his Excellency sent for Col. Tache. He consulted with me, and I accepted the task, holding the same position in the government that he previously held with regard to Sir Allan McNab, and that Mr. Morin had formerly held with regard to Sir Allan McNab. The government is now formed and it is for this house to say whether it will accord it that confidence which will be necessary to conduct the government of the country.²²

MR. LORANGER [said], as allusion had been made to the circumstance of the late Attorney General East not being in his place, [he] begged to read a few lines he had received from that gentleman. — “Being prevented,” Mr. Drummond said, “from going down to the house by severe, though I hope temporary indisposition, I must beg you to apologize to the house for my absence on an occasion when explanations of an important character may be expected from me.”²³ He (Mr. Loranger) begged to state that although Mr. Drummond felt indisposed, he had no doubt that he would be in the House by to-morrow or next day at furthest.²⁴

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — I think the Attorney General West has withheld from the house an important explanation which we were entitled to receive at his hands. He has omitted in any way to allude to the policy which the new Administration intends to carry out. The natural inference, I suppose, is that the new Administration consisting of the same members, with two exceptions, who a few days ago received the condemnation at least of the representatives of Upper Canada, are to pursue the same policy which has heretofore characterized them. Yet I suppose we must take it for granted also, after the explanations that have been given by the Attorney General, that the Postmaster General returns to the

Administration on the understanding that he was to bring that support from the Reform party which would secure for him a position of strength in the carrying on of the affairs of the country. But it is due to the house that without any delay the Postmaster General should rise in his place and explain that he has not returned to his seat without assurances from his party that he will be sustained in taking a part in this reconstruction of the Cabinet. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney General has ... avowed himself a Conservative. And he tells this house as a Conservative that he called upon another Conservative, Mr. Vankoughnet — to whom he gave a high character, which I suppose no one will gainsay — to assist him in carrying on the government. This being so, we should expect the Postmaster General to state what support he is to receive from his side of the house — (hear, hear) — when he joins an Administration, into which such a Conservative as Mr. Vankoughnet has been taken in — what number of professing Reform members view that fact with satisfaction, and are ready to support him better than they did the other night, when they voted a want of confidence in him. (Hear, hear.) The house will be anxious to hear from those members the grounds on which they have receded from that vote, if they have really done so. (Hear, hear.) I for one do not see how the country can find in this reconstruction anything to inspire more confidence than was reposed in the Administration before. I am sure that, if the Receiver General (Mr. Morrison) were in his place, he would rise and readily give those explanations which we ask for at the hands of the Postmaster General. And I shall now sit down to receive from the Postmaster General those explanations, and to afford him an opportunity also of explaining what is that policy which has gained for him again that support from his Reform friends which was withdrawn the other night.²⁵

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The hon. gentleman has called on the Postmaster General for an explanation of the policy of the Government. It is well known that during the course of the present session, there was a joint meeting of the Reform members who usually supported the administration, and of the Conservative members who also usually supported the administration, and that they met for the purpose of considering whether all the great questions which formerly kept them separate have not been finally settled, whether they could not act as one compact moderate party, free from reactionary principles on the one side, and from the principles of Republicanism on the other. At that meeting they did come to a complete understanding, that they should be one party, whether considered as progressive Conservatives, or as Conservative Liberals.²⁶ (Hear, hear, and laughter.)²⁷ Hon. gentlemen laugh, but I believe there is in moderate Conservatism, the Conservatism of the present day, as much liberality [sic] as there is in the sentiments of those hon. gentlemen who laugh.²⁸ (Hear, hear.)²⁹ The arrangement, or fusion was complete, and the gentleman who came in, Mr. Vankoughnet, having been fully prepared, as a Liberal Conservative — (ironical cheers) — to agree to this fusion of the moderate men of all parties, and seeing that he could act cordially with the Reform members of this house who usually support the Government, as well as with the Conservatives, had no hesitation in joining the Government on that ground. We are attempting, and I hope successfully, to form a moderate Government, a Government supported by moderate Conservatives and moderate Liberals, free from the extremes of both sides. (Ironical hear, hears.) If we have the confidence of this house we shall attempt to carry on the principal measures which the last Government commenced³⁰. [The new Administration shall attempt] to carry through the business of this House generally, as laid out by the previous Administration, and he [Mr. Macdonald] took it for granted that he would receive the support of this House. The measures now before the House would be pressed upon their attention, with the exception of the Police Bill.³¹ That Bill will not be pressed. The reason why it is not pressed this session is that the cities which are chiefly affected by it, with two exceptions, have remonstrated against that Bill. It is therefore well worthy of consideration whether that measure cannot stand over for another session. — In England the same course has been taken. When similar measures have been introduced for England and Ireland, to get a uniform Police system, they have all — though some of them have since become law, been opposed in the first instance by the localities to be affected and which would have had to bear a considerable portion of the expense. This measure, however, is one which I believe to be of great value, one of which the

gallant Knight, the member for Hamilton, may be proud. He took great pains with it, as well as with the Militia Bill, first as a Commissioner, and afterwards as head of the Government. I think we can well afford to let it stand over, for I believe the more it is considered by the people of this country, the more will they approve of a measure to give organization to the Police of Canada. It will stand before the people. They can judge of it. It can be fully discussed in the public press during the recess, and I hope the result will be the passage into law of that measure or some one like it.³² For the other measures they looked for the support of this House.³³

SIR A. MACNAB. — I think it due to myself to say a few words in consequence of what has fallen from the Attorney General. I had intended to confine myself entirely to the explanation which it was my duty to give to the country, and which I have already made, unless, in the course of the debate, it should become necessary that I should say something more. The Attorney General says, in other words, that I have been ejected from the Government, and that Mr. Vankoughnet has been called into it, because he is more acceptable to the Liberal portion of that Government than the member who has now the honour of addressing you. When that Government was formed, the Attorney General, the Inspector General, and myself, were supposed to be introduced into it, for the purpose of representing the Conservative party in this Province. That Conservative party, on the late vote, gave that Government 20 votes from Upper Canada, and originally there were but 23 Conservative members, of whom I was one, and I was not in my place. Now, Sir, I would like the Attorney General, or the Postmaster General, or any member of that Government, either inside of the Government or outside of the Government, to stand up in this house, and to state to the members of the house any liberal measure that has ever been introduced by any one of them, that has been opposed by me. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire that I should go before the country, on the statement of any member of that Government, as being illiberal. (Hear, hear.) I am as sensible of the change that has taken place in the opinions of the people of this country, and their advance in liberal opinions, as any man in this house; and I could not sit quiet and hear such a reason assigned for the recent changes, without protesting against it — (hear, hear) — because I defy any member in that Government or out of that Government, to say that any liberal measure proposed by them, or by any one of my colleagues, has ever been opposed by me. When I say that, I think I say all that is necessary to justify myself before the people of this country.³⁴ (Applause.)³⁵

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — I had hoped that I should have had no occasion to trouble this house. (Laughter.) I say again I had hopes that the explanations of the hon. and gallant member for Hamilton, who had just retired from the Government, and the explanations of the hon. and learned Attorney-General West, who has just assumed the management of the Government business of this house, would have been quite sufficient, without any further explanations on my part. But the member for Glengary has thought proper to call me out, and I have not the slightest indisposition to meet his call, in reference to my past conduct as a member of the late Administration, or in reference to my conduct in joining the present. It is true that, when I joined the late Administration, it was in connection with the amount of support supposed to be held and to be given by the leader of the former Administration, now Governor of Barbadoes. It was in bringing to the gallant Knight the support of what were called the Hincksite Reformers, that I and the late Speaker of the Upper House were accorded seats in the Government. At that time, the Government decidedly partook of a coalition character; and although I have myself had reason to say frequently, as I now say again, that that Government was not strictly of a coalition character, because the members were agreed on their policy, and because the Government carried out its policy, still it was the name by which it was conveniently known at that time. I repeat, then, that in that Government, I was one of the representatives of a certain section of the Ministerial supporters in this house, known as the Hincksite Reformers. And the statement is perfectly correct, that when I found myself deprived of the aid and assistance of those gentlemen, who had generally given the Government their support till last Tuesday, when an Upper Canada adverse vote was taken, I felt it to be my imperative

duty to make known to the gallant Knight, the member for Hamilton, the leader of the Administration, my impression that I could be no longer serviceable in the Government, as I was deprived of that support which I had had before from those gentlemen who had given a vote expressive of their want of confidence in the Government — and that I could not feel it to be my duty to continue longer a member of the Government. I need not go over all the ground that has already been occupied in reference to those changes. I shall only allude to that part of it which relates to myself and my acceptance of my present office. The member for Glengary asks me if I bring to the support of the Government the Liberal aid that I formerly brought to it. I tell the member for Glengary frankly, I know nothing about it. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Glengary may laugh, and hon. members may cheer ironically, but I repeat, I know ... nothing about it. But I am quite satisfied that those gentlemen, whose support I have long enjoyed, whose support the late Government enjoyed, are as capable as ever they were of distinguishing between the policy and the principles of the present Administration, and the policy and principles of the gentlemen who form the Opposition. I have said the term Coalition is now a misnomer. I consider the Coalition Government has passed away, and I look upon the present as a united Government, composed of progressive men, whose policy will be found to meet with the acceptance of the masses of the people of Canada.³⁶

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — What name do you give to it? (Hear, hear.)³⁷

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — As to the name, the name is the Government of Canada. (Laughter.) Their policy will be understood by the future conduct of the Government. Mr. Speaker, I have been drawn by the cheers, which I perfectly understand, from the opposition, and by the laugh of the member for Glengary, into remarks of a more lengthy character than I would otherwise have felt it my duty to make. No man can be ignorant of the fact that the landmarks of party have been swept away. There is no man who has had a knowledge of passing events, but must have seen that within the last two and a half years, step by step those lines which formerly marked the bounds of party have been swept away and obliterated. (No, no.) It is remarkable that I hold in my hand a copy of a veracious journal, the *Globe*, of July 1854.³⁸

Cries of "Oh! oh! That's the old story."³⁹

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE continued:] This paper declared that the distinctions between constitutional Reformers and progressive Reformers had been swept away. Is not that the condition of things now? What question is there now, which is, properly speaking, a Reform question? And why should the introduction of members professing liberal principles into the government, be prevented, because their forefathers quarrelled about certain questions? Party questions may arise, but surely those questions which were agitated twenty years ago exist no more. For my part, I have accepted the invitation of the leader of this house, who was charged by the leader of the Government with the formation of the Upper Canada section of the Ministry, in the most perfect confidence that his opinions and his views, and his general policy, will be in accordance with the wishes of the Reformers of Upper Canada. I know of no Reformer who will say he is not satisfied with those who are prepared to apply a remedy to existing abuses. I do not belong to that class who, for the sake of party, and for the sake of office, are determined to perpetuate those questions. I have felt it to be my duty to accept the invitation given me by the Attorney General West; and I think the good common sense of the people of Canada will support a Government which is determined to resist the aggression of principles represented by the opinions of hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am of opinion, and those who have joined with me in forming a Government are of opinion, that the disunion principles which prevail on the opposite side of the house, can have no acceptance with the people of this country. We shall oppose those principles, and knowing no great questions agitating the people of Canada — knowing nothing that we have to do, but to manage the public departments with wisdom and economy — I have not the slightest doubt that the action of the Government will meet the just and reasonable expectations of the people of Canada.⁴⁰

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — The explanations of the Attorney General West were such as might have been expected from him. He claims for the Government the name of Progressive, which the Postmaster General accepts, having at last become ashamed of the name of Reformer. (Hear, hear.) The Postmaster General says the Government has no name but the Government of Canada. We can only infer that he has sacrificed the Reform position he has held in the country, and which he tells us he held in the Government as a representative of the Hincks Reformers. But now, when he represents no party, he joins a Conservative Government, and says he does not know what support he is to get. He joins that Administration, not as the representative of the Reform party, but because the Attorney General asked him to join it — as a Conservative of course, for he repudiates the name of Reformer. (Hear, hear.) All his former declarations were, that so long as his Reform friends supported him, he would maintain his position, and when they withdrew their confidence he would resign, and he has told us that he retired from the late Government, because he did not get the support of Reformers. How then does he go back to that position when he cannot tell us whether he is to get the support of a single Reformer. Why are the Government ashamed to avow their policy? The Attorney West tells us he was anxious to call to his aid a Conservative having a progressive character. But no sooner does the gallant knight, the late leader of the Government, hear that, than he rises up and defies any member of the Government to say in what instance he has opposed any liberal measure proposed by the Cabinet for the good of the country — so that the house is left to inquire whether this resignation was not brought about because they could not get quit of the gallant knight otherwise, and introduce into the Cabinet a gentleman notoriously known to entertain views hostile to the views of the Coalition, having even refused to accept a Crown Council engagement, because he did not wish to be identified with the Coalition in any manner or form. Why then was the gallant Knight got rid of, if it was not because he was not liberal enough, or because he obstructed their measures? No explanation of this has been given us. And I ask, is it not the fact that this return of the self same men to the councils of her Majesty's Representative is merely a *ruse* to get rid of the gallant Knight? What an advance truly has been made in progressive principles, in calling in Mr. Vankoughnet! The country will be surprised to hear of that gentleman entertaining more liberal views than those of the gallant Knight, who tells us he has made no opposition whatever to the liberal views of his colleagues. The Attorney General says, the object is to create a progressive party, and to prevent the progress of the Ultra Reform party. But whom have they brought in to defeat combinations desirous of bringing about annexation and destroying the connection with the mother country? I believe that they have selected a gentleman (Mr. Terrill) who signed the annexation in 1849. (Hear, hear.) I presume his recantation of those views must have been given in to his Excellency. Surely the Attorney General would not have taken him in, on any other terms. This is the government that the Postmaster General is about to go into. This is the government that he desires his friends to support, particularly his friends the member for Peterboro', and the member for Lennox and Addington. Had they not always been dissatisfied, because the Tory element was too strong, and had they now got a better position. I ask those hon. members if they are satisfied with this state of things. Did they vote to turn out the last Administration because of its too Conservative character, and are they now to go back to support it in its present reconstruction. I shall be very much disappointed if the house does not now, in the most unmistakeable manner, mark its disapprobation of this course, and if the country does not do the same. And let me tell the hon. gentlemen who have made up this administration, as they have done, that they are mistaken as to their strength in this house, and that it will take them a long time to atone for having followed the course that they have done.⁴¹

MR. LORANGER said, that in the new character of an opponent of the government, he wished to make a few explanations with regard to the change in his position.⁴² Partisan de l'administration, c'est de tout coeur que je regrette de ne pouvoir appuyer le principe sur lequel elle vient de se réorganiser. Ce principe est, suivant moi, du plus grand danger; à certains égards, il est même une violation de la constitution. En résignant sur une majorité du Haut-Canada, l'administration a sagement reconnu le principe de la double majorité, et en cela personne ne peut lui refuser ses éloges; car la double majorité est la

protection des deux sections de la province et en particulier du Bas-Canada.⁴³ Il est bien beau en théorie de soutenir que l'Union n'ayant fait qu'une province du Bas et du Haut Canada, une majorité collective doit les gouverner, mais cette théorie est impossible en pratique. Quel est le ministre du Bas-Canada, qui se trouvant en minorité dans sa propre section de la province, voudrait la gouverner par une majorité du Haut contre le vœu du Bas Canada?⁴⁴ (Hear, hear.)⁴⁵ Et ce qui est vrai par rapport au Bas-Canada, l'est également par rapport au Haut.⁴⁶ He considered it the duty of the members of either section to resign when they found their own section against them.... No minister of the Crown would be justified in ruling his own section of the country by a majority from another section.⁴⁷

La double majorité est surtout la protection du Bas-Canada, en ce moment où l'on agite l'augmentation de la représentation ayant pour base la population, quoique les efforts de certains hommes pour accréditer ce gouvernement ne soient guères redoutables. En résignant sur ce principe le ministère a donc sagement agi; mais à mon avis il a commis une erreur en réorganisant comme il l'a fait le Haut-Canada, ou plutôt en ne le réorganisant point, puisque le personnel de l'administration Haut-Canadienne est le même qu'il était avant sa résignation. L'on a, il est vrai, remplacé Sir Allan McNab par M. Vankoughnet, mais il n'y [a] là qu'un chan[ge]ment de noms; ils appartiennent tous deux au même parti politique, le parti conservateur. Sans discuter la convenance de cette substitution au point de vue du mérite des deux hommes, je désire énoncer et soutenir ici, une doctrine que personne ne me disputera, et que n'a cependant pas respectée le dernier remaniement ministériel.⁴⁸

He would like to put this question to the house. Is it constitutional for a ministry to resign to-day and come back to-morrow as a new ministry. (Hear, hear.) He regretted exceedingly to be obliged to withdraw his confidence from the ministry, but he felt it his bounden duty to vote as he intended to do. But there is a constitutional principle at the bottom of this question, which must guide us with regard to it.⁴⁹ Un ministère qui résigne un jour, ne peut pas le lendemain venir devant la Chambre constitué comme il l'était la veille.⁵⁰ (Hear, hear.)⁵¹ Ce serait une violation de l'esprit de la constitution, une moquerie de la représentation. C'est ce que pourtant ont fait les ministres Haut-Canadiens qui viennent de remettre et reprendre leurs portefeuilles.⁵² When the voice of the people had been once given against an Administration they must either resign or advise his Excellency to go to the country.⁵³ Ils admettent eux-mêmes qu'ils ont interprété le vote de la majorité du Haut-Canada comme un acte d'hostilité à la coalition, mais en même temps ils prétendent que leur gouvernement reconstitué comme il l'est aujourd'hui, n'est plus un gouvernement de coalition. Eh bien! je le demande à la Chambre: Est-il dans son enceinte un seul homme qui ajoute foi à cet avancé? Qui croie [sic] que l'accession au pouvoir de M. Vankoughnet qui a toujours ouvertement professé les mêmes principes politiques que le ci-devant premier ministre, change le caractère du pouvoir dont il présidait les délibérations?⁵⁴ Could they say that they had made away with the coalition, because they had replaced one member representing one class of opinions by another representing the same opinions. The gallant knight had said that he was always ready to support liberal measures, and he (Mr. Loranger) for one had always seen him ready to support such measures, but since the vote of the house was against the coalition, the coalition should have disappeared.⁵⁵

Personnellement j'entretiens pour M. Vankoughnet les sentiments d'une estime bien sincère. Je me plais à reconnaître hautement la position distinguée qu'il occupe dans la profession dont je me fais honneur d'être membre, je rends justice à son talent et à l'amabilité de ses relations privées⁵⁶. But, politically speaking, they must put their personal feelings out of the question in matters of this kind.⁵⁷ Son entrée au pouvoir viole un principe vital de notre condition politique, et c'est pour moi un devoir impérieux d'exprimer ma désapprobation. Sous l'empire du principe de la double majorité, la résignation d'une section de la province qui se trouve en minorité doit nécessairement entraîner pour la réorganisation ministérielle de cette section, les mêmes conséquences qui résulteraient d'une résignation de cabinet motivée par une majorité de toute la Chambre. La résignation dans les deux cas est soumise aux mêmes conditions, à la même nécessité d'aviser l'appel au peuple, ou de se reconstituer d'une manière différente en appelant d'autres hommes pris dans le même parti, dans de rares occasions, mais le plus souvent dans un parti différent.

Non pas que j'émette la prétention que l'accession au pouvoir nouveau d'un seul homme ne satisferait pas l'exigence de la situation, et qu'ainsi reconstitué, le nouveau pouvoir ne puisse revenir devant la Chambre, pourvu que ce nouveau ministère professe d'autres principes que celui qu'il remplace, et qu'il apporte un nouvel élément au cabinet dans lequel il vient occuper un siège. Est-ce maintenant le cas? C'est ce que montrera l'événement si sur la motion qui est maintenant soumise à la Chambre, l'accession de M. Vankoughnet change en majorité la minorité de Sir Allan McNab, je me serai trompé; mais si loin d'être diminuée la majorité Haut-Canadienne augmente son chiffre, qu'elle le double ou peut-être le triple, ce qui probablement arrivera, j'aurai raison; car le représentant du Haut-Canada aura montré l'accession de M. Vankoughnet comme apportant un élément nouveau à la section ministérielle qu'elle a désavouée. L'on donne pour raison que l'impopularité du cabinet dans le Haut-Canada vient de la maladie de Sir Allan McNab qui l'empêche d'assister aux délibérations de la Chambre, et on croit faire disparaître le mécontentement en lui choisissant un successeur qui n'a pas du tout de siège.⁵⁸ (Hear, hear, and laughter.)⁵⁹ En exprimant ainsi mon opinion contre le principe de la reconstruction du cabinet dans le Haut-Canada, je ne désire point m'enrôler dans les rangs de l'opposition. Loin d'opposer systématiquement le gouvernement, je soutiendrai les justes mesures qu'il apportera; mais sur ce point que je considère comme d'une importance vitale au principe de la responsabilité ministérielle, je ne puis rester muet sur les fatales conséquences d'un précédent aussi dangereux que celui qui vient d'être consacré. J'ai soutenu jusqu'ici la coalition; quand j'ai présenté la réponse au discours du trône, j'ai dit que je la considérais comme une nécessité politique; que nous devons la soutenir comme nous procurant le seul moyen d'assurer la majorité du Haut-Canada aux mesures que le pays réclamait à grands cris; et au commencement de cette session, j'ai répété la même opinion. Mais maintenant que loin de nous assurer cette majorité, la coalition ne peut donner au gouvernement que la minorité Haut-Canadienne, l'on aurait dû la faire disparaître⁶⁰. He regarded the vote on Monday last as a condemnation of the coalition, and the Attorney General West supported him in that view, when he said that the coalition was at an end, but he thought that so far from putting an end to the coalition it was stronger than ever.... When he saw the vote of the Upper Canada members against the coalition, he flattered himself that a coalition could be formed in Lower Canada, but it appeared that such was not the case. He was not entitled to speak for Mr. Drummond in this matter. It would be improper for him to do so, but in Lower Canada nothing had been changed, except that Mr. Drummond went out and Mr. Terrill came in. For Mr. Terrill, personally, he was very happy to see him in a government, and he was sorry not to be able to support him in that position, but he could not extend to him the same confidence that he felt in Mr. Drummond.⁶¹ Que l'on ne comprenne pas qu'en désapprouvant la réorganisation du pouvoir dans le Haut-Canada, je désapprouve également la section Bas-Canadienne d'y être demeurée. Au contraire, ayant la confiance de plus des deux tiers de la majorité du Bas-Canada, elle n'était pas obligée de se reconstituer [et] de changer l'élément de la composition. Je regrette infiniment et cela avec l'unanimité de cette Chambre, que les nécessités de la situation aient forcé l'ex-procureur-général Est, à quitter l'administration, et déplore surtout la raison qui lui a dicté cette conduite. Le premier ministre n'étant pas en Chambre, c'était le droit du Bas-Canada, qui avait assuré à l'administration une majorité collective de vingt votes, qu'un de ses ministres en dirigeât les délibérations comme *leader*. Je ne connais pas de synonyme [sic] français pour ce mot. Ce n'est pourtant pas ma raison déterminante, et ça n'a pas été non plus une matière de sentiment que ma résolution de désapprouver la récente réorganisation, comme certain honorable membre l'a insinué.

Dès l'instant que j'ai appris que la section Haut-Canadienne restait au pouvoir, j'ai exprimé ma désapprobation; je l'ai en plusieurs occasions exprimé à l'ex-procureur-général, et je lui ai intimé dès l'abord, le jour même que le Colonel Taché lui fit l'offre de faire part du nouveau ministère, que j'opposerais le principe de la combinaison, qu'il retournât au pouvoir ou qu'il refusât d'en faire part. Car je voyais comme je le vois encore dans son principe une violation de la double majorité que je considère comme notre sauvegarde. Je dois avant de m'asseoir rassurer les craintes de quelques-uns [de] mes amis, si ces craintes existent, en déclarant que par mon vote qui repousse un précédent que je trouve dangereux,

je n'entends désertier en aucune façon le parti auquel j'ai toujours appartenu. Je professe pour l'ex-secrétaire provincial en particulier qui en politique a été pour ainsi parler mon parrain d'armes, dont j'ai en tous temps admiré le patriotique désintéressement et le zèle pour l'intérêt public, les mêmes sentiments d'estime et de considération pour la rectitude de ses vues politiques.

Je regrette infiniment la division du Bas-Canada en deux camps politiques, division qui affaiblit nos forces et est fatale à l'intérêt général; j'espère que ces divisions s'effaceront, mais tant que malheureusement elles existeront, tant qu'il y aura deux partis, je n'abandonnerai [sic] pas le mien. Loin de chercher à influencer ceux de mes amis qui me font l'honneur de me consulter en certaines occasions, je leur ai dit comme je le répète maintenant que je serais heureux de voir les choses autrement que je ne le fais si j'avais quelque doute sur la rectitude de mon opinion, comme eux je la sacrifierais avec plaisir au désir de procéder à la dépêche des affaires et de voir se terminer la session. Mais je ressens [sic] trop vraiment le danger du précédent que l'on vient d'introduire pour faire taire mon opinion. Mon silence serait une lâcheté peu digne de mon caractère personnel et indigne de mon devoir envers mes constituants.⁶²

CAPT. RHODES said that he intended to give a direct vote against this Administration, but before doing so he wished to ask a few questions, the answer to which might influence his future conduct, as well as that of other members from Lower Canada. He wished to know whether the members of the Government from Lower Canada, who had just entered the Government, held the same political opinions as those who held seats in it before, and whether they were to be considered as liberal Conservatives or Conservative liberals. He also wished to know whether the Administration held any settled opinions on the question of the Seat of Government. He was also particularly anxious to know whether they had a railroad policy. (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada they had other railroads besides the Grand Trunk. They had the North Shore railway and Colonization roads, and other things all connected with the same subject. He thought it very desirable that the Administration should explain to the House their views on these subjects.⁶³

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON was extremely sorry at the declaration of the hon. member for Laprairie that he had lost the confidence of that gentleman, but he (Mr. Cauchon) could see nothing in the speech of that hon. member to show what had induced him to change his opinion. He was not in favor of the double majority system; at the same time he was ready to say that if the members from Lower Canada ceased to have confidence in him, he would not attempt [to] carry on his government in opposition to their feelings. This was not a constitutional question; it was simply to be decided by the vote of a majority of the house, and they had often seen men coming back into office after a defeat. In this there is no constitutional question involved, nor is any privilege invaded; it is a matter for the house to decide. Those who are in opposition at this moment cannot say that their wishes ought to be attended to; for they were in a small minority in the house, and all the measures of the Administration were carried by large majorities. They might call him by what name they pleased, but he was ready to support any liberal measures that might be desired by a majority of the people. He was not an annexationist and he never would be, and he was Conservative in this sense, that he desired to preserve what was good and throw away what was bad. (Hear, hear.) He had shown that he could sacrifice his opinions (ironical cheers) when he found that public opinion was against him. No man, except in cases of personal honour, or where justice was concerned, should stand in the way of public opinion when the great majority of the people were against him, unless when advocating some new principle, when a man might stand alone.⁶⁴

MR. PATRICK called the attention of Mr. Cauchon to the railway policy, of which he had said nothing in reply to the questions put to him.⁶⁵

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — The day is still bright, and there is plenty of time for that. Does the vote of the hon. member depend on the answer to these questions? (Laughter.) He then repeated in French what he had said in English.⁶⁶

MR. LORANGER (in French) replied, that he did not oppose the Government from sentiment. He had told the Attorney General Drummond that whether he remained in the Government or left it, that he (Mr. Loranger) should oppose the accepting [sic] the principle of the double majority, as had been practically done.⁶⁷ An adverse vote of Upper Canadian members was equivalent, as far as the Upper Canadian members of the Cabinet were concerned, to an adverse vote of the whole House in England. Would anybody say that if a Ministry were forced out upon such a vote in England that the same men could come back to the Parliament as forming a Ministry? He held such a course to be unconstitutional. He looked upon those men coming back in this way, ignoring the double majority system, as dangerous to the liberties of Lower Canada, for unless that system was preserved, Upper Canada might at some future time, rule Lower Canada, by an Upper Canadian majority.⁶⁸

MR. RANKIN. — I rise simply to ask a question. Am I correct in my understanding of the explanations made by the hon. and gallant Knight, and the hon. and learned Attorney General for Canada West? I inferred that the whole Cabinet had tendered their resignations to the Governor General, and that those resignations had been accepted?⁶⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD then rose and read the following documents: —

"Messrs. Spence, Macdonald, and Morrison having intimated their intention of resigning office, His Excellency the Governor General is compelled to state to Sir Allan MacNab, and to the remaining members of the Adminis[tra]tion, his strong conviction that, under existing circumstances, it will be impossible for him to replace the gentlemen now proposing to retire in such a manner as to maintain the efficiency of the Council, or the principle on which it was originally formed.

"On the other hand, His Ex[c]ellency desires it to be understood by the whole Council that he considers the mere fact of an adverse vote of one section of the Province, whether Upper or Lower, as no constitutional reason for resigning office. What His Excellency looks to is the confidence, or want of confidence, in a Ministry of the Legislative Assembly as a whole representing the people of the United Province of Canada.

"There are, no doubt, strong reasons, at the present moment against a dissolution of Parliament, but it is unnecessary to consider what His Excellency would be prepared to do if the Government in its present form, including Messrs. Spence, Macdonald, and Morrison, recommended him to dissolve Parliament.

"Assuming that the three gentlemen named above persist in resigning, His Excellency feels bound to say that he could not consent to dissolve with a view of testing the confidence of the country in the remaining portion of the Government, or in any modification of it to be made on the spur of the moment.

(Signed)

"EDMUND HEAD."

"TORONTO, May 22nd, 1856.

"Yesterday afternoon, at 4 p.m. Sir Allan McNab waited on His Excellency the Governor General, and informed him that the several members of the Council who had in the morning personally signified their intention to resign, still adhered to this decision. And under these circumstances, Sir Allan MacNab and the remainder of the Council, though not recognising a sectional majority as a sufficient reason for a change of Government, had no alternative but to place the offices they now hold at His Excellency's disposal.

"Sir Allan further conveyed to His Excellency, as the view of the majority of the Council, advice on their part to send for the Hon. Col. Tache, with a view to the reconstruction of a new Government, or the modification of the existing one.

"His Excellency has now to convey to Sir Allan McNab, in a formal shape, his acceptance of the resignations of the gentlemen who have offered them, to take effect so soon as their successors are appointed. His Excellency further expresses his conviction that he has no alternative but to look upon the present movement as a virtual dissolution of the existing Administration. His Excellency does not

by this admit or sanction in any way, the doctrine of a double or sectional majority as necessary to a Government in Canada. On the contrary, he states unhesitatingly that it is a doctrine at once irrational, and if carried out might involve the consequence of a Ministry being obliged to resign, although the party by whom they had been defeated did not, and could not, possess the confidence of the Legislative Assembly.

"With regard to the advice to send for Col. Tache, his Excellency conceives that a breaking up of the Government in being necessarily leaves him, as the Queen's representative, free to exercise his discretion in the choice of the person to be entrusted in the formation of a new one. His Excellency did not solicit advice in this matter from the members of the Council, but nevertheless feels indebted to them for offering it. His Excellency has reflected that, in fact, there has been no ministerial defeat; such as would ordinarily imply that one party, other than that now holding office, possessed the confidence of the representatives of the people. On the contrary, the Government have still numerically a good working majority in the Assembly. His Excellency further considers that the principles of Col. Tache, his high personal character, and his long experience in politics, make him in all respects a fit and proper person to be entrusted with the remodelling of this Government, or the construction of a new one; and under the circumstances, His Excellency requests that Col. Tache may wait upon him with as little delay as possible.

(Signed)

"EDMUND HEAD."⁷⁰

SIR A. MACNAB. — I endeavoured to make myself as well understood as I could upon the question which the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Rankin) has put. After the resignation of the four gentlemen, His Excellency enquired, if I was prepared to fill up those vacancies from the house? I said, "No; nor was I prepared to tender my resignation, because that I did not approve of the reasons which induced my hon. colleagues to tender theirs." But I said to His Excellency that if it became necessary for His Excellency to use my office in the formation of any new Government, that he was at perfect liberty to do so. I endeavoured to make myself understood in the beginning, and I hope that my hon. friend understands me now. Of course I could do nothing else.⁷¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD alluded to an article which appeared in to-day's *Leader* which was attributed to the hon. and gallant Knight. Was there any truth in the statements therein appearing?⁷²

SIR A. MACNAB said, nobody knew better than the hon. gentleman himself that there was no truth in it, except as to the reasons which induced him to differ from his colleagues, of which he had made four copies to send to the newspapers when the explanations were given on Friday last, one he sent to the *Globe*, another to the *Colonist*, and the others to newspapers in the country, but he had no communications with the hon. members for Glengary, London, or Essex, upon the subject, neither did he recognise anything that had appeared in the *Leader*.⁷³

MR. RANKIN was gratified to think that he had in the first instance correctly understood the explanations given. The question, however, which he proposed to submit to those hon. gentlemen, who had a better understanding of constitutional law than he could lay claim to, was simply this: If the hon. gentlemen who proposed to form the Administration had tendered their resignations, and whether those had been accepted by the Governor General. Was it not clear that those gentlemen for a time had ceased to be Ministers of the Crown, and members of the Administration? Had not this fact occurred, that although it may have been for twenty-four hours, that this Province had found itself without a Government. If they had ceased, although for so brief a time to be members of the Administration, he would like to know what right they had upon their being again re-appointed by the same authority, to come down to this House and take their seats without the question being submitted to the country, and to ascertain whether their constituents approved of their becoming Ministers of the Crown a second [sic]

time, after having ceased to be so, any more than the member for Niagara (Mr. J.C. Morrison) had a right to do so.⁷⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said, it was provided by the bill passed a year or two ago, that any minister of the Crown who might vacate his seat and accept another office under the Government, if done within the space of one month, did not require to go back to his constituents for re-election.⁷⁵

MR. RANKIN said, he could not expect to know all about it. It had struck him that if a minister ceased to hold office for one day that he was out altogether. Then the matter clearly resolved itself into this. The whole thing had been compared to a shuffle of the cards. There had been that shuffle with this result, that the gentlemen opposite had got rid of "the king of trumps," while all the knaves remained in the pack. (Great laughter.)⁷⁶

MR. TURCOTTE (in French) then said, that there was nothing in the constitutional point raised by the hon. member for Laprairie, (Mr. Loranger). How many times did it happen in England, that the accession of one member was considered to effect such a difference as to enable a falling Government to go on? It was not then the same Government. Even if there had been no change in the members of the Government at all, they might have come back here since they had not been rejected by a majority of that house. He repudiated the principle of double majorities further than this, that after each general election the Governor General should endeavour to choose his ministry for each section from the majority of that section so far as that was possible. But it would have been absurd for ministers to resign on such a sectional vote, for example, upon that which took the Seat of Government to Quebec, and other instances that he might mention. Was the hon. member for Laprairie prepared to desert the Conservatives of Upper Canada to enlist under the banner of the member for Lambton? Could he go to elections in such company in any constituency in Lower Canada? He was not prepared to give ministers that entire confidence which he had given them, when he found the ex-Attorney General for Canada West was in the cabinet, but he would give them fair play. He hoped that they would take a bolder course.⁷⁷

MR. CHABOT said it was not his intention to say whether the present Government is good or bad. That question was not before the chair. — If the explanations up to that time had not been satisfactory, he trusted that other explanations would be given before the discussion terminated, which would prove satisfactory. Some maintain the principle of a double majority, others are opposed to it. For his own part, he could not maintain the principle that a Government should resign because it might have an adverse sectional vote on a question of general interest. In a question purely sectional, as for instance a judicature bill or an education bill the case would be different, but he cannot think it justifiable that a ministry should resign because it might have an Upper Canada or Lower Canada majority, on a question affecting equally both sections of the Province. He would say no more about the resignations. For his part, he could not see any great change if Sir A. McNab went out and Mr. Vankoughnet came in. He regretted most heartily that Sir A. McNab withdrew from the Government. He regretted it because he had great confidence in that gentleman's honesty, in his abilities, and in his love for Lower Canada. He believed that the greatest friend he had is Sir Allan McNab. He had no doubt that if Sir A. McNab had been able to attend during the whole session in his place, that he would not now have been out of the Government. A new Government was now formed, and he thought the house ought not to be called on to declare against it without knowing its principles. Though he regretted that Sir A. McNab was not in it, and that the late Attorney General East had withdrawn from it, he would still persist in the course that he had pursued. He would not judge of the ministry by the men of whom it is composed, but by its acts. The members of an Administration to him were merely abstractions. If the Government was to be really a Government of progress, as the Postmaster General said, then he would support it most heartily, for we had arrived at that period in Canada, when no government can maintain itself which is not a Government of progress, and assuredly such a Government will have the support of a large portion

of this house. Now, he would take the liberty of asking a question, and he hoped the Government would answer it categorically. What kind of a Government have we? He trusted that the house would not rise before the question was answered. When the motion of want of confidence was under discussion, some members said that they withdrew their confidence on account of the ministerial policy on the Seat of Government question, and for having brought down a vote of £50,000 to erect the public buildings at Quebec. Others said that it is unnecessary in the present day to have a Coalition Government; that a Coalition Government had been formed to carry out certain objects, and that they had been accomplished, and therefore it was time to say adieu to Sir A. McNab. That hon. member had loyally carried out all the good measures which had been entrusted to him, and as a reward for doing so he was to be turned about his business. It had been already said in general terms, that there was no change in the ministerial policy, but he would wish to have some more specific and definite statement. He would wish to know of the new Government if their policy towards the Seat of Government is the same as it was before? If they upheld the demand for £50,000 to spend on public buildings at Quebec. He thought that the question was clear and should be answered. He would not argue the question of the Seat of Government, but he would leave to those gentlemen who had declared their intention to vote for any place, no matter at what extremity of the Province it might be, as a permanent Seat of Government, and who had afterwards voted against Quebec as the permanent Seat of Government, to explain how they could make it appear that they were sincere. The member for Maskinonge had said that it is necessary to have a strong Government, he recognized the full force of that observation. He admitted that there was nothing which did so much mischief to a Government as feebleness or hesitation. That had always been his firm conviction; and he would say that he hoped the Government would be prepared to deal firmly with the great question of the Grand Trunk Railroad. Up to the present time nothing was [sic] known of the intentions of the Government with respect to that road, except what had appeared in some public prints in which, he was sorry to say, it is impossible to put any confidence, or to believe what they say from day to day. He would ask if the Government intends to do anything towards the completion of that road? He believed that the country had a right to know, and the sooner they obtained that information the better, for the whole country was largely interested in that enterprise. And he did not fear to say that in spite of all the faults and errors of the Grand Trunk, the public opinion is decidedly in favour of that great enterprise being carried to completion. He is disposed to give the Government a fair trial, to give them every possible chance. He would support them as long as their acts would authorize him in doing so. He concluded by saying that he hoped the administration would shortly be baptised, and that a name may be given to it by which it may be recognized.⁷⁸

MR. ALLEYN did not think the reason assigned for the resignation of the late ministry a satisfactory one. He did not think they should have resigned because on a vote of non-confidence they had an Upper Canada majority of six against them, especially when the vote was mixed up with the question of the Seat of Government. He admitted, however, that if a majority from Upper or Lower Canada voted continually against the ministry of their own section of the country, they ought to resign. But he did not [think] that one vote, such as that of the other night, and particularly from such a changeable set as the Upper Canadian liberal supporters of the ministry had shown themselves to be this session, justified them in resigning. In regard to the new Administration he would not oppose them till he saw their measures. By their measures they should stand or fall. Some questions had been put to the ministry which had not been answered, and which he thought should have been answered, especially in regard to the appropriation for public buildings at Quebec. The late Attorney General East had stood up in a manly way, and stated that the vote of £50,000 was to be brought down as a Government question. He wished to know whether the present government intended to bring it down as a government question. And with regard to railroad matters, he would like to know what was to be the policy of the Government in regard to the Grand Trunk and North Shore Railroads. He was not prepared to say that the North Shore, in its present state, would be of great advantage to Quebec or Montreal. It was more an Upper Canada than a Lower Canada road in its present shape. Still the matter had been brought up, and he would like to know

what was to be the policy of the government in regard to it. As to the Grand Trunk the question now was, as it was no new matter, whether they were to complete it, and he must say he was prepared to give it a liberal support with that view. He had great doubts whether the change in the Upper Canada portion of the Administration would add much strength to it. He believed that in the honesty and firmness and manliness of the late leader of the government, the country had great confidence, and for his own part he regretted extremely that an old Tory had been obliged to go out merely to let a new Tory in, for that seemed to be the whole effect of it. (Hear, hear.) He did not agree with the Postmaster General in the remarks he made about the sweeping away all the landmarks of party. Under our form of government he thought there must always be parties; and he hoped that by their acts the present government would show that they belonged to some distinct and definite party, so that members might know under what flag they were sailing. He had great confidence in the integrity and probity and straight forwardness of the Commissioner of Public Works. He had great confidence in his politics, and believed him to be a sound Reformer. But he did not attach much weight to the remark of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that *his* policy was to support every measure that was good, and to go against what was bad. There was no man but would say the same thing. But he would like to hear from the government what they thought good, and what they thought bad. (Hear, hear.) He was free to admit that that statement by the Commissioner of Crown Lands was not sufficient to retain his confidence in the government.⁷⁹

MR. A. DORION said that, of the various announcements made to-night, there was one which would be on all hands hailed with pleasure, and that was that the nondescript character of the administration had at last ceased — that from a Coalition it had become a Conservative government. (Hear, hear.) The Reformers throughout Canada would hear with pleasure that they had now to deal with a Conservative government; and Conservatives would hear with pleasure that they were now represented in the government, not merely by the Attorney General West, but by such Conservatives as the Postmaster General and the late member for Niagara, and it would be a great satisfaction to them to be able to say that they had made such converts. In dealing with the late administration, when the opposition reproached it with being conservative, they pointed to the Postmaster General and the late Speaker of the Legislative Council and the member for Niagara as being reform elements in the administration. And when on the contrary conservatives reproached them with being too liberal, they pointed to the gallant knight and the Attorney General West as conservative elements. Now all that was ceased, and they had it from the mouth of the Attorney General West, that at last the administration had come to be, what the opposition had always said it would become, a Conservative Administration. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney General West said that a conservative he had always been, and that he called in his friend, a conservative, to assist in forming this administration. He had the courage to come down and say it was a conservative administration, and to this the Postmaster General assented. All this would at least have the effect of opening the eyes of some hon. members who had fancied that some good would come out of the coalition, that some liberal measures might be expected from them. And to-night they had heard liberal members who had supported the coalition till now, declare that they had no longer any confidence in them. And just now they had heard the two hon. members for Quebec put questions to the administration which were yet unanswered, and which if answered in the negative, he understood those hon. members to say that they would go into Opposition. It was a singular thing that the Postmaster General who left the Administration three days ago as a Liberal, because he had lost the Liberal support, now returned to it as a Conservative. It was certainly a curious thing that that hon. gentleman and the member for Niagara who resigned because they could only command 2½ votes each of the Liberal party, went back to the Government, although it had undergone no change but the substitution of Mr. Vankoughnet for the gallant member for Hamilton, so far as regarded Upper Canada.⁸⁰ This explained the caucuses and intrigues that had taken place lately. The object evidently was to get rid of Sir A. McNab.⁸¹ As regarded Lower Canada, the only truly Liberal member of the Administration from that section had gone out, and the Government was now in the hands, not of the Progressives, as the Attorney General West pretended, but in the hands of the most retrograde party of Lower Canada and of the whole Province. Who did not know that the

Commissioner of Crown Lands had made all his popularity by the energy with which he used to advocate in his paper the most ultramontane and retrograde principles, and by enlisting in his interest the prejudices arising out of religious feelings? Was not the hon. member the most forward when the religious Corporation Act was brought forward last session to come up and oppose it, and not only that but by every means in his power he tried to influence the people of Lower Canada against it, by saying that they intended to uproot the Catholic religion by advocating principles just in themselves, and which he has now himself to vote for. He says he is willing to go for Reform as far as possible, and yet when he found himself with only three others on the Legislative Council Bill and found that he could not prevent its being carried into effect he entered into the Administration for [t]he purpose of carrying it out. This is one of the elements of the present Administration and the head of it they knew to be one of the most Conservative of the Lower Canadian members. The administration had been defeated by the adverse vote of the Liberals of Upper Canada, and yet the man chosen to form the new administration was the most Conservative of the Lower Canadians. It appeared to him that, instead of some hon. members waiting to judge of the administration by the measures they will bring forward, [they] had better judge to-night by the declarations they had made. It is now the proper time to let parties know what is to be their future policy. (Hear, hear.) When a new administration has been formed, now is the time at which it should be judged. It had declared itself to be a party government, and must be judged by the declarations made at its formation, which had been very scanty indeed. They had not ventured to say what they intended to do with the Grand Trunk. It was admitted on all hands that the Grand Trunk could not be left in its present state. Some policy ought to be adopted, and it was time that they knew what that policy would be. There was another question which had been one of the causes of the fall of the late administration, the permanency of the seat of government; which a majority of the Upper Canadian members desired to see made a government question. From one end of the Province to the other, every one was interested in this question, and the country should know what the opinion of the government was with regard to it. There was another question which had been passed over very lightly, the question of the North Shore railway. It was evident that an undertaking, to which it was proposed to give three or four millions of acres of land, ought to be brought up as a government question, and they ought to know whether they intended to press it on this session or not. These were points on which they should get distinct and definite answers. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had said that this was not a vote of want of confidence. The only answer to that was, why then did they resign. (Hear, hear.) With the Attorney General East out of the administration, he had far less confidence in it than he had ever had in the coalition, and with a view of at once testing the feeling of the house, he would move a vote of want of confidence in the following terms: — “That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency, expressing the regret of this house at the present change in the administration, as not being such as to secure to the confidential advisers of his Excellency the confidence of this house and of the country.” He felt it necessary to test this question as early as possible, and he had no doubt that the result would be a majority of fifteen or twenty against the ministry, and that they would be compelled to adopt the same course on this vote that they had done on the previous one.⁸²

MR. CHABOT objected to this motion as being out of order, no notice having been given.⁸³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER decided that the motion could not be put.⁸⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that it was due to the house and to the administration that this motion should not be put without notice, that absent members might be able to attend. They were anxious to have the vote as soon as possible, but they should have proper notice of the intention of the gentlemen opposite.⁸⁵

MR. A. DORION said that his only object was to have the matter settled as soon as possible. While a vote of want of confidence was pending, they could not go on with the business of the country.⁸⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD would like to ask if there was not another motion that hon. gentlemen opposite intended to put to the house?⁸⁷

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said that there was another reason why they should delay. On a former occasion, it took the opposition two days before they could draw up a motion to answer the object they had in view.⁸⁸

MR. BROWN denied that there was any desire on the part of the Opposition, to take advantage of the Government. The Government ought to have known that the member for Glengary had put a notice of a similar motion on the paper on Friday last, and he maintained that they had not altered their position since then. And then as to the support they expected to obtain in the house, had not the Postmaster General told them that he knew nothing about it. If the motion was put off now, they would have the whole debate over again; and he apprehended that every member in the house knew what was expected to come up, and he thought that if the hon. Attorney General would look over the list and see who were absent, he would find that there were as many away who would vote for the motion as against it. It was not for the hon. member to make those accusations about another motion being in reserve. The Government had only to say what time they required to bring their followers together, and then they would take the division and see whether the Government had lost the confidence of the House or not, and he thought that when they came to the division, they would find it a more serious matter than they at first anticipated. If the Government did not desire to take the vote now — if they wished either to continue the discussion or adjourn it — they had only to name their own time, and the Opposition would agree to it. He believed that there was something far beyond the mere question as to who should fill those benches. The real question was, what the future policy of the Government would be, and it was full time that this should be brought to an issue at the earliest moment.⁸⁹

MR. WILSON would like, since the government required the notice alluded to, to ask them a few questions. If there was any cause for their resigning, (and he understood that [sic] there was not) how came it that the hon. and gallant knight and other hon. gentlemen now occupied their seats. (Hear, hear.) Because if constitutionally the hon. and gallant knight was right in maintaining the position he did, it was perfectly constitutional for the government to carry on the business of this house, having a majority of it in their favour. How came it that they felt it their duty to resign, because that a majority of Upper Canadian votes was against them, and that the members of the Administration kept their present position. The house would like to know something about their intended railroad policy, and whether it was to be the same as that of the last Administration. How were they going to deal with the Grand Trunk and North Shore interests, and all the railroad interests of the country. Then was the country to have no explanations given of why our debentures were unpaid, from the Inspector General. What was his deep policy upon that matter. And who was to lead the Administration. Was it to be the Attorney General East or West. He hoped the Attorney General West would, and that his past experience would teach him a little more discretion hereafter. (Laughter.) Then enlightenment should be thrown upon the management of the Departments, and when the Administration had done all this, the Opposition would consider how far they could give them their confidence. Then explanations must be given upon the Seat of Government question. Were those hon. gentlemen going to carry out the appropriation for those buildings in opposition to the vote of this house? Because if the Union is to [be] preserved that question is involved. The Opposition would have no objection to give the hon. gentlemen all the time they pleased, to give the information demanded by the country of them.⁹⁰

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER (in French) addressed the house. After expressing his friendship for the member for Laprairie, he declared his opinion to be, that notwithstanding the declaration of that hon. gentleman against the Government, he would alter his opinion after having had an opportunity to judge

of all the facts. The member for Laprairie had first of all opposed the ministry on constitutional grounds, but he believed that on those grounds the hon. member was mistaken. Then he had said that his confidence in the ministry had been lessened by the departure from it of the late Attorney General. No one respected that hon. gentleman more than he, but the member for Laprairie ought to get rid of all influence arising from his friendship for that gentleman. That hon. member had said, that for the ministers who had resigned to come back again, was to violate the privileges of the house and of the people. That was a mistake. One of the documents which had been read to the house, explained the circumstances under which the resignation had taken place. It was not the Lower Canadian ministers who were the first to resign; and the Upper Canadian members resigned because a portion of them represented a party who had withdrawn its support. But all Lower Canadian members had not withdrawn their support from the ministry. He then went on to answer the hon. member for Laprairie's argument. He would like the honourable member wish to see the members for Lower Canada united, but he would have nothing to do with a gentleman whose policy was equally repugnant to Lower Canada and the great majority in Upper Canada. As to the allegation that a member of the other house, instead of *that*, was the Premier, the hon. member ought to recollect that British Ministries had repeatedly had their Premiers in the House of Lords. The constitutional practice was, in cases of a vote of want of confidence, for the Sovereign to appeal to the chiefs of the party which has overturned an administration. But, in this case, such could not be done, since the vote was not adverse to ministers as a whole, but in their favour. Yet the member for Laprairie had argued that the Governor General should have properly taken more material from the ranks of the Opposition. Why should he take in more men from a party which stands in such a miserable minority as regards Lower Canada? and thus ostracise the countrymen of the hon. member who contends therefor. Perhaps he (Mr. C.) might be told that an appeal should have been made to the Upper Canada Opposition. Would the member for Laprairie (Mr. Loranger,) have had the hon. member for Lambton called in? Surely he could not look with favour to the advent of an ultramontane party. The Governor General, in sending for a distinguished Lower Canadian, to fill the place of chief minister of the Crown, had certainly not adopted a course which should be distasteful to Lower Canadians. Although the Lower Canadians had a large majority on the vote in question, the Lower Canadian ministers had resigned because of the retirement of the Premier, but it was a mere matter of etiquette, nothing more. It was not on account of any expression of want of confidence in themselves, implied by the vote of the Legislative Assembly. With respect to the reference made to the policy of the new ministry by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Chabot), he could assure him that it was fully intended to support and carry out the recommendation contained in the estimates, for a sum to be expended at Quebec in the establishment of a permanent seat of government. The newly formed cabinet would call upon the house to vote this appropriation. (Hear, hear.) And as regards the railway policy of the new ministry, touching the Grand Trunk railway, the time to declare it had not yet arrived. The subject should be dealt with by the present government with proper regard to the credit of the Province, and in view of the paramount necessity of duly developing the resources of the country. He did not think that any government should deal with such a question in a narrow spirit, or as affecting merely shareholders and contractors; and the new executive would not do so. They also intended to carry forward the North Shore railroad scheme, initiated by their predecessors.⁹¹ Quant à la dissolution de la chambre, c'est une question qui sera laissée à la décision du gouverneur, et sur laquelle ils se régleront sur l'action de la chambre, plutôt que d'après une idée préconçue des ministres.⁹² No answer could therefore be now given to the enquiry on that head. The Government would likewise endeavour to go on with the measures now before the house. With respect to the Upper Canada portion of the new Ministry, it was no longer a Coalition (ironical hear); but as formed of parties equally opposed to the fanaticism of the hon. member for Lambton, and removed from the Toryism of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron.) Their views were identical with those held by their Lower Canada colleagues. All were therefore liberal without being extreme, and determined to resist the agitations of the hon. members for Lambton and Haldimand, both of whom desired representation by population for the purpose of enslaving Lower Canada.⁹³

MR. MARCHILDON regretted the resignation of Sir A. McNab⁹⁴. [He] highly complimented Sir Allan MacNab on account of the solicitude he had always shown to accord justice to Lower Canada, and hoped that those members from Upper Canada who are desirous of meting out equal justice to both sections of the Province would be cordially supported by their constituents. He denounced the Grand Trunk Company, and trusted that means would be adopted to get rid of it.⁹⁵

MR. HOLTON moved that the orders be now read.⁹⁶

MR. A. DORION then moved his motion of want [of] confidence, in amendment.⁹⁷

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD then moved that the house do now adjourn⁹⁸.

(543)

Mr. *Holton* moved, seconded by Mr. *Sanborn*, and the Question being proposed, That the Orders of the day be now read;

Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *Brown*, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing the regret of this House that the recent changes in the Administration are not such as to secure to the Constitutional Advisers of His Excellency the confidence of this House and of the Country" inserted instead thereof;

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

The House adjourned.⁹⁹

Footnotes

1. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856, reports the following information: "The Speaker took the chair at three o'clock, and shortly after the door was opened the galleries were lined with ladies and gentlemen desirous to hear the Ministerial explanations. The old members of the new Ministry were in their places. Mr. Attorney General Drummond was absent through indisposition. Sir Allan MacNab occupied a seat in the front benches, alongside of Mr. Chabot, the new premier occupying the seat formerly awarded to Sir Allan." In a commentary, *Globe*, 27 May 1856, reports the following remarks: "The sensation in the neighbourhood of the House of Assembly yesterday afternoon at 3 o'clock, was something to be remembered. Every seat in the gallery was filled as soon as the doors were opened, and all eyes were immediately bent upon the various gentlemen affected by the new ministerial arrangements. Mr. Attorney General Macdonald occupied the seat on the front row of the ministerial benches hitherto occupied by Mr. Drummond, and Mr. Cartier sat beside him as the Lower Canadian leader. Sir Allan sat on the front row immediately below the ministerial seats, and next to Mr. Chabot. Mr. Drummond was not in the house, being indisposed, but his friend, Mr. Loranger, was found seated among the Opposition, as was Mr. Felton. The countenances of ministers were gloomy and depressed; they did not seem in the least like men who had made a satisfactory arrangement of matters and who were looking forward to a coming success; they had more the air of condemned criminals, about to be led to the gallows."

In a commentary, *Montreal Gazette*, 27 May 1856, reports the following information:

"The Ministry was re-organised on Saturday.

"The Hon. Colonel Taché is Premier and Speaker of the Upper House.

"Hon. J.A. Macdonald, Attorney General West, and Leader of Lower House.

"Hon. Geo. E. Cartier, Attorney General East.

"Mr. Terrill is appointed Provincial Secretary.

"Mr. Vankoughnet is appointed President of the Council, &c.

"The Hon. Mr. Drummond retires.

"All the rest remain as they were."

Montreal Gazette, 27 May 1856, also comments on the reconstruction of the Cabinet, as do *Toronto Daily Leader*, 26 May, 29 May, and 3 June 1856; and *La Minerve*, 29 May 1856.

2. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
3. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
4. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
6. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
7. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
8. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
11. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
12. *Montreal Gazette*, 28 May 1856.
13. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
14. *Montreal Gazette*, 28 May 1856.
15. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
16. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
20. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
22. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856, reports that Mr. J.A. Macdonald "spoke at some length, but in so low a tone that he was indistinctly heard in the gallery." In a commentary, *Globe*, 27 May 1856, also reports that "the new Upper Canadian Premier spoke in a tone so low that members not far distant were frequently obliged to ask him to raise his voice in order that they might hear him. All his jauntiness was gone, as with blanched lips, and feeble air, he went over a number of points of more or less importance. We do not exaggerate in the slightest degree these appearances. The evident terror and apprehension of Mr. Macdonald excited sympathy even among his opponents. Perhaps the most important point of his speech was that in which he declared that the double majority system was indefensible, that the late ministry had not resigned so much on account of the Upper Canadian majority against them, but because the defection of their supporters showed that a worse defeat was in store for them."
23. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
24. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856.
25. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
28. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
30. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
31. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
32. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
33. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
34. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856, notes that Sir A. MacNab "boldly challenged ... [his colleagues] to name the liberal measure ever suggested by the most liberal member of the Government that he had opposed, and although the challenge was fairly given, the members of the Government remained silent under it."
35. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
36. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*
41. *Ibid.*
42. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. The primary source used to reconstitute this speech was *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856; excerpts from the *Globe* were added when they contained additional ideas or information. The reader will note, however, that the organization of the statements differs completely from one newspaper to the other. We have followed *La Minerve's* order, even though the *Globe's* report seems more logical at times. The reconstitution of this speech thus remains arbitrary.

43. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856. *Globe*, 27 May 1856, reports that Mr. Loranger stated that "he was in favour of the principle of a double majority", and that this elicited some cries of "oh, oh."
44. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
45. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
46. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
47. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
48. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
49. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
50. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
51. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
52. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
53. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
54. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
55. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
56. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
57. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
58. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856. *Globe*, 27 May 1856, reports this statement in the following manner: "Among the rumours out of doors, and which he also believed he had heard in the house, it was stated that the late hon. Premier had resigned because his indisposition prevented him from attending to the business of the house, and it was very singular that they had replaced him by a gentleman who had not even a seat in the house."
59. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
60. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
61. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
62. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856.
63. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
64. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
65. *Ibid.*
66. *Ibid.*
67. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. *La Minerve*, 3 June 1856, reports a similar statement which is placed at the end of Mr. Loranger's first speech (see p. 2207). *La Minerve* does not report Mr. Loranger's second intervention; therefore, we cannot ascertain whether or not Mr. Loranger repeated the same statement.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
69. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
70. *Ibid.*
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
75. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. *Le Pays*, 31 May 1856, which otherwise translates this account, reports the last sentence of this speech as follows: "Il n'est pas prêt à donner aux ministres l'entière confiance qu'il leur a donnée, en voyant que M. Drummond n'est pas dans la [sic] cabinet, mais il veut leur donner franc jeu. Il espère qu'ils prendront une position décidée."
 In a commentary, *Globe*, 27 May 1856, reports that Mr. Turcotte spoke in defence of the Ministry, "but was considerably taken aback when Mr. Loranger asked what had induced him to change his mind within three hours." No other newspaper reports an intervention of this nature by Mr. Loranger.
 According to *Telegraph (Montreal Transcript)*, 27 May 1856, the House adjourned for its afternoon recess while Mr. Turcotte was speaking.
78. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
79. *Ibid.*
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
82. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
83. *Ibid.*
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*

86. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
 87. *Ibid.*
 88. *Ibid.*
 89. *Ibid.*
 90. *Ibid.*
 91. *Ibid.*
 92. *Le Pays*, 31 May 1856. This source is used here as it reports the best excerpt, but it is otherwise a summarized translation of the account in the *Globe*.
 93. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. In a commentary, *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 30 May 1856, reports that Mr. Cartier also stated that the new Ministry "shall oppose representation by population ... because it is unjust toward Lower Canada."
 94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
 95. *Globe*, 27 May 1856.
 96. *Ibid.*
 97. *Ibid.*
 98. *Globe*, 27 May 1856. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856, reports the following information: "Mr. Dorion moved a motion of want of confidence but the government objected to it upon the ground that no notice had been given. About eleven o'clock Mr. Holton moved that the orders of the day be now read, and Mr. Dorion moved his motion as an amendment, thus evading the rule. The Attorney General at once moved the adjournment of the House which was granted without discussion."
- Commentaries on the debate of this day are reported in *Globe*, 27 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 27 May 1856, *Perth Courier*, 30 May 1856, *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856, and *Western Planet*, 2 June 1856.
99. Both *Globe*, 27 May 1856, and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856, report that the House adjourned "at half-past eleven".

TUESDAY, 27 MAY 1856

(544)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Jobin*, — The Petition of *Luke Corcoran*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. Alphonse*.

By Mr. *Darche*, — The Petition of *C. Dansereau* and others, of the Parish of *Verchères*.

By Mr. *Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Marie de la Beauce*; and the Petition of the Reverend *P.H. Suzor* and others, of the Parish of *St. Christophe d'Arthabaska*.

By Mr. *James Smith*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Eldon*.

Mr. *Jobin*, from the Standing Committee on Contingencies, presented to the House the Seventh Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee beg leave to submit the following Estimate, prepared by the Accountant, of the probable amount for the Contingent Expenses of the Legislative Assembly for the current year, in accordance with the amount contained in the Estimate already laid before Your Honorable House, and being exclusive of that portion of Indemnity provided for by the Act 12 *Vic. cap. 33*: —

	£	s.	d.
In part of Indemnity to Members, as per Resolution of the House during the present Session	7500	0	0
Salaries	12600	0	0
Extra Services	1750	0	0
Messengers	2450	0	0
Expenses of Committees	350	0	0
Library	750	0	0
Printing, Printing Paper, and Binding	24000	0	0
Stationery	1750	0	0
Postage	2000	0	0
Newspapers	600	0	0
Tradesmen <i>et al.</i>	2000	0	0
Insurance	250	0	0
Miscellaneous	5000	0	0
	£ 61000	0	0
Deduct by Address of 4th March, 1856	£10000	0	0
Deduct by do of 28th April, do	10000	0	0
	20000	0	0
Leaving to be supplied, the sum of	£ 41000	0	0

On motion of Mr. *Jobin*, seconded by Mr. *Darche*,

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to issue his Warrant in favor of *William Burns Lindsay*, Esquire, Clerk of this House, for a further sum of Forty-one thousand pounds, currency, on account of the Contingencies of this House; and assuring His Excellency that this House will make good the same.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

(545)

On motion of Mr. *DeWitt*, seconded by Mr. *Holton*,

Ordered, That the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to amend an Ordinance of *Lower Canada* for the relief of certain Religious Societies," be now read for the first time.

The Bill was accordingly read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time To-morrow.

The House proceeded to take into consideration the Amendment made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the *Quebec* and *St. Francis* Mining and Exploring Company;" and the same was read, as followeth: —

Page 1, line 24. Leave out from "words" to "five" and insert "a qualified person, or two, three, four, or."

The said Amendment, being read a second time, was agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. *Rhodes* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath agreed to their Amendment.

The House proceeded to take into consideration the Amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the *Canada* and *Liverpool* Mining and Exploring Company;" and the same were read, as follow: —

Page 2, line 10. Leave out from "due" to "possessed" and insert "to or."

Page 2, line 13. Leave out "Corporation" and insert "Association."

Page 2, line 16. Leave out "Association" and insert "Corporation."

Page 2, line 21. Leave out from "property" to "do" in line 22.

The said Amendments, being read a second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. *Foley* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath agreed to their Amendments.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*,

Ordered, That the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to amend the Militia Law," be now read for the first time.

The Bill was accordingly read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time To-morrow.

The House proceeded to take into consideration the Amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Act authorizing Disinterments in certain cases in *Lower Canada*:" and the same were read, as follow: —

Page 1, line 10. After "authority" insert "of the *Roman Catholic Church* in *Lower Canada*."

Page 1, line 11. Leave out "Township," and after "Mission" insert "of that Church in *Lower Canada*."

Page 1, line 14. After "Priest" insert "or," and leave out from "Missionary" to "and."

Page 1, line 15. Leave out from "Wardens" to "of," and after "the" where it occurs the second time, insert "*Roman Catholic*."

Page 1, line 21. Leave out "Minister," and leave out from "Wardens" to "as."

Page 1, line 27. After "Priest" insert "or," leave out from "Missionary" to "and," and leave out from "Wardens" to "of" in line 28.

Page 1, line 29. After "Priest" insert "or."

Page 1, line 30. Leave out from "Missionary" to "ministering."

Page 1, line 32. Leave out "Minister."

Page 1, line 33. Leave out from "Wardens" to "for."

Page 1, line 38. After "Priest" insert "or."

Page 1, line 39. Leave out from "Missionary" to "or" where it occurs the second time, and leave out from "Wardens" to "all" in line 40.

Page 2, line 3. Leave out from "Wardens" to "shall."

Page 2, line 4. After "a" insert "*Roman Catholic*."

Page 2, line 6. After "known" insert Clause (A.)

(546)

Clause (A.) "Before proceeding to any disinterment in any burial ground under this Act permission to that effect shall be obtained from the Superior Ecclesiastical authority of the *Roman Catholic Diocese* in which the same is situate."

In the Preamble of the Bill:

Page 1, line 4. Leave out from "mentioned" to "therefore" in line 6.

The said Amendments, being read a second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath agreed to their Amendments.

On motion of Mr. *Stevenson*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Robinson*,

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the Eighteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Printing.

A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fennings Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery: —

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council have passed the Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm the partition made by the Trustees of the Will and Codicils of the late *Anne Powell*, of the Real Estate of the late Honorable *William Dummer Powell*, and for the appointment of new Trustees, and for other purposes," without any Amendment: And also,

The Legislative Council have passed the Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the *Victoria Mining Company*," with an Amendment, to which they desire the concurrence of this House. And then he withdrew.

Ordered, That the Bill to amend the Act of Incorporation of the *Woodstock and Lake Erie Railway and Harbour Company*, as reported from the Standing Committee on Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines, be committed to a Committee of the whole House.

On motion of MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD¹,

(546)

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the said Committee.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Roblin* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed him to report the same, without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

MESSRS. FOLEY and ROBINSON desired, that certain unopposed private measures should be proceeded with.²

MR. HOLTON thought it of importance, that the motion of want of confidence of [sic] the new Administration should first be disposed of.³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD then moved that the orders of the day be read.⁴

[The motion] was agreed to, the first order being Mr. Dorion's motion of want of confidence.⁵

(546)

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

(547)

The House resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, yesterday, proposed to be made to the Question, That the Orders of the day be now read; and which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing the regret of this House that the recent changes in the Administration are not such as to secure to the

Constitutional Advisers of His Excellency the confidence of this House and of the Country” inserted instead thereof.

MR. GALT said that in rising to address the House on the motion of his hon. friend from Montreal, expressive of a want of confidence in the Administration, he trusted he should be permitted to refer to the very unsatisfactory character of the recent ministerial explanations. No person could have listened to them, particularly those given by the hon. Attorney General West, without feeling satisfied that there was something hidden behind them — a something he did not wish to state — which would prove an embarrassment to those hon. gentlemen, and also that in these explanations there was not only no proper statement of the principle on which the resignation had taken place, or of that on which the new Government assumed office. There was also another subject of very general complaint in the House. On Friday last, none of the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches were prepared to enter into any explanation of the resignation, which it was then known had taken place and on that occasion,⁶ the Solicitor General East promised that on Monday the Government would be prepared not merely to explain why they had resigned, but why they had not given those explanations at the earliest possible opportunity.⁷ But that promise had not been satisfactorily redeemed. If, however, they had to complain of a want of satisfactory information from the members of the Government, in that House, they had fortunately⁸ an opportunity of referring to the explanations and narrative of facts given in another place, and they found that Colonel Tache had given the Legislative Council a better and more succinct narrative of the causes and circumstances of the resignation than this house had been favoured with.⁹ In his explanation, that hon. gentleman say[s] that at noon on Weenesday [sic] a Cabinet Council was held at the residence of the hon. and gallant Knight at the head of the late Administration, a defeat having taken place on Tuesday night. At that meeting the hon. gentleman states that the Attorney General West — not the Postmaster General — took the initiative in tendering his resignation. And that hon. gentleman adduced as his reason for taking that step that although the Government was still sustained by a considerable majority, still such votes might be repeated and greatly enfeeble the Administration. The hon. the Poatmaster [sic] General, Mr. Morrison, (Niagara) and the Inspector General followed their [sic] example, declaring their belief that the Administration could not be sufficiently carried on under the double majority principle. About a quarters [sic] of an hour afterwards, we are told His Excellency took his place at the Council Board with the paper in his hand, which was read to this House last night¹⁰, [and which] Colonel Tache read to the Upper House¹¹. Now, he (Mr. Galt) took it that that paper formed an extraordinary part of the explanations that ought to be given. The document was, it is asserted, presented by His Excellency before any resignation had taken place; and hence they were, of course, entitled to hold those hon. gentlemen forming the late Administration,¹² responsible for the advice under which his Excellency acted in reading that paper to the Council. He had said it was a remarkable document. While on the one hand they found it stated that the first intimation of the resignation was given in the Cabinet Council held on Wednesday at noon, they found it stated in this paper, prepared before the meeting of the Council and read to it¹³, that “Messrs. Spence, Macdonald, and Morrison having intimated their intention of resigning, his Excellency the Governor General is compelled to state to Sir Allan MacNab and to the remaining members of the Administration, his strong conviction that under existing circumstances it will be impossible for him to replace the gentlemen now proposing to retire,” and so forth.¹⁴ How had his Excellency become acquainted with the fact that Messrs. Spence, Macdonald and Morrison were to resign? He apprehended that there was but one constitutional course through which that information should have been given to his Excellency, but they did not learn that that course had been followed. (Hear, hear.) What then were they left to conclude but that those gentlemen went to his Excellency without having previously consulted the gallant Premier and the rest of their colleagues?¹⁵ We are bound to consider, either that those hon. gentlemen did previously tender their resignation, and advised his Excellency to act as he had done, or else that the other statement that the resignations were tendered at the Council board, was a mis-statement. They had a right to have an explanation on that point.¹⁶ His Excellency comes down to the Council,

stating that those gentlemen had resigned, and they found that his Excellency was prepared at that time to state to the leader of the Administration that he could not allow him to attempt to form another Administration, by filling up those three vacancies. (Hear, hear.) On whose advice did his Excellency act in making that declaration?¹⁷ Or did he act on his own proper responsibility?¹⁸ He would like to know whether that advice was tendered to his Excellency by a united Cabinet, or only by a section thereof — whether at the very period they felt themselves compelled to resign, they had advised His Excellency how to act?¹⁹ Had there been advice given by individual Ministers not acting in Council, or tendering it through their acknowledged chief? If that were so, the Government was resorting to an expedient with which he was sure the people of this country would not be satisfied.²⁰ That document to which he referred, and for which the Ministry would be held responsible, contained an expression of certain opinions as to the policy of that House. It stated that it was his [Excellency's] strong conviction, that under existing circumstances, it will be impossible for him to replace the gentlemen now proposing to retire, in such a manner as to maintain the efficiency of the Council, or the principle on which it was originally formed.²¹ He would like to know whose opinions were expressed in this document: whether they were those of the Cabinet or of the Governor? Who was responsible for these opinions?²² This was a most important State document, which had been presented to that House, and surely they were bound to enter into an explanation of it. And again, as to the concluding paragraph, he would like to know what it meant: — “Assuming that the three gentlemen named above, persist [sic] in resigning, His Excellency feels bound to say that he could not consent to dissolve with a view of testing the confidence of the country in the remaining portion of the Government, or in any modification of it to be made on the issue of the moment.” Now, what does that mean? There is an ambiguity in the sentence, for the grammatical sense is, that “a modification of it,” necessarily refers to the remaining portion of the Government. He would like to know whether that opinion of his Excellency applies to the existing Government or not?²³ Were they to understand that he was prepared to dissolve when the gentlemen who had resigned came back? He thought the House was entitled to further explanation from the Atty. Gen. West and the Postmaster General on these points. He was sure that the hon. and gallant Knight, the late Premier, if he had known these gentlemen had waited on the Governor General previous to the Council at which they formally tendered their resignation, he would have stated it in his explanation.²⁴ However, to consider the explanations as they were given — brief, disjointed, and he might almost say, incoherent — considering them as conveying a real statement of the facts, what do we find? We find that the Attorney General West, the Post Master General, the Receiver General and the Inspector General, went out of office — not because of the double majority principle, but because they had lost the confidence of that section of the House they represented in the Cabinet.²⁵ They professed to condemn and repudiate the principle of double majorities.²⁶ But if they did not go out on that principle, on what principle *did* they go out? Was it to be supposed that those hon. gentlemen had accepted the support of a variety of parties in the house for the purpose of getting into the Government, and when those parties had withdrawn their support they had gone through the sham of resigning for the purpose of availing themselves of the political position their friends had previously given them, to step in again ready to set at naught all the principles they had formerly advocated? (Hear, hear.) The Postmaster General had explained that he did not go in now to represent a party, but simply at the bidding of the Attorney General West, so that he was now responsible to no one in this house but to his leader the Attorney General West. But a greater responsibility rested on the Attorney General — that he should have been the means of breaking up the Government, and after he had broken it up should have gone back again, and by a sort of legerdemain change his position and say — “I no longer appeal for support to gentlemen from Upper Canada, but if I can get a majority of the whole house, I will continue to hold office.” If they did not resign on the double majority principle, there was only one other way of explaining it. There must have been some element of weakness in the Cabinet, which it was necessary to get rid of. Supposing this to be the case, they must look to results to find out what that element of weakness was, and it would be found that the gallant knight was the only one who had retired. There was no change of policy or of measures, but a change of one man. It appeared

that the whole sins of the Coalition had to be visited on the head of the gallant knight.²⁷ He was the scape-goat for the misdeeds of the Government — and they piously resolved to offer him up as a sacrifice to the patriotism of the people of Canada. (Laughter). The House had, however, already received some revelations with regard to the conduct pursued by those hon. gentlemen towards the late Premier. On more than one occasion, charges of intriguing and caballing in the Cabinet, were made in the House, and it would be in the recollection of the House that on one of those occasions the Attorney General West found it necessary to get up and state the proceeding of a caucus, at which certain hon. gentlemen proposed that he should assume the leadership. The reply of the hon. gentleman on that occasion, was,²⁸ that the gallant knight was his leader, “and so long,” he added, “as the gallant knight will lead I will follow.” (Hear, hear.) Why then did he not continue to follow? Had anything occurred to change the relations of the Attorney General West to the gallant knight? It was due to the house that the Attorney General, after that declaration, should explain how he now found himself sitting in the seat of his former leader, whom he had thrust out of the Cabinet. (Hear, hear.) Was the gallant knight the cause of the recent motion of want of confidence? Not the slightest reference was made in the debate on that motion to the Premier as being the cause of the weakness of that Administration. (Hear, hear.) They were charged with having on more than one occasion violated the constitution of the country. The gallant knight was not specially responsible for that. They were charged also²⁹ [with] incompetency, and departmental mismanagement. Was the late Premier responsible for ... [their] departmental mismanagement, when he was not at the head of a single important public department? The Administration was also charged with an absence of policy on all the great questions before the country. And was the hon. and gallant knight, who was unable to occupy his seat on account of illness, to be charged with that? These were the charges made against the Administration. On this bill of indictment they were tried and found guilty³⁰, and they would not escape punishment by offering up the gallant knight as a sacrifice. (Hear, hear.)³¹ And how did these hon. gentlemen seek to remedy the evil? By removing the late Premier and then going out of the House to choose a gentleman almost unknown in the House, except to the Attorney General West, who announced him as a gentleman holding conservative views. (Hear, hear.) The recent changes in the Cabinet would not only alienate from the Government the support of the Upper Canada members but also those of Lower Canada³², [for] while the Administration had removed their Upper Canada leader, they had also lost undoubtedly the ablest member they had from Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.)³³ In consequence of his absence from the House, they had heard no explanations of the causes of his conduct, in the House but from what fell from the Premier elsewhere they learned that Mr. Drummond had claimed and had been refused the leadership of the House. The Opposition had no right to dictate as to the member of the Administration who should lead, but no one could pretend to say that the Government had been strengthened by the loss of such a man, so long recognized as a political leader — possessed of so much ability and parliamentary experience, and by the substitution of Mr. Terrill in his place.³⁴ [OR] His withdrawing from the Government, and the taking in of Mr. Morrison would, he felt confident, materially decrease the strength of the Administration. (Hear, hear.)³⁵ It seemed then that the present leader of the House, the Hon. Atty. Genl. West, had not only supplanted the hon. and gallant knight but the late Attorney General for Canada East also.³⁶ The present Attorney General East (Mr. Cartier) appeared to occupy the same position towards Mr. Drummond, as the Attorney General West occupied to the late Premier, and it was for that gentleman to explain why the late Attorney General East [had] retired. He would not remark on the position of the Receiver General, as that gentleman was not in his place. But it would be remembered that on the occasion of that gentleman coming into the Government, in room of Hon. Mr. Ross, there was the same difficulty and delay in obtaining explanations, as had been the case in reference to the recent changes. If we had reason to be very little satisfied with the personal explanations of the administration, we have still less reason to be satisfied with the explanations of policy and principle which they have made. They were not in reality prepared to offer any explanation of policy, and the very name of principle was abjured.³⁷ The fact was that the new Administration set out without policy or principle — their sole reason for holding office, being, as the Postmaster General had observed, for the purpose

of opposing hon. gentlemen on his (Mr. Galt's) side of the House. (Laughter.)³⁸ They expected the Opposition to originate the great measures of legislation for the country.³⁹ And not only had their abandonment of principle been made manifest in that House, but it had also been confirmed by Colonel Tache's statement in the Upper House, where, in answer to the query from an hon. gentleman, whether in entering the Government the Reform members had deserted their party and the Conservative members deserted theirs, the hon. Colonel Tache replied — Yes! Yes, so it was; the hon. Postmaster General, hon. Attorney General West and the rest of those hon. gentlemen had all sacrificed their party to their position. (Hear, hear.)⁴⁰ We have also the admission of the Postmaster General that he has deserted his party, but not until the party had deserted him.⁴¹ But he [Mr. Galt] sincerely trusted those hon. gentlemen would yet receive at the hands of the House such an expression of opinion as would convince them that the people of this country require a Government with a policy and at least some degree of principle. (Hear, hear.)⁴² They come before the House, accepting all the sins of the old Government, accepting all their old measures, even the great bill, the Police Bill — which they only desire to lay over until time is afforded to the country to give it proper consideration. We will have a repetition of those same speeches of the Postmaster General which we are told are to live through countless ages as models of sublime eloquence. We will still have the same claims for gratitude held up⁴³. We are attempted to be consoled, however, with the announcement that there is no longer a Coalition Government — that the present Government were exceedingly desirous to get rid of it. (Hear, hear.) How did that agree with the Postmaster General's previous statement, that if there was one thing more than another in which he gloried, it was the Coalition. It was really surprising that those hon. gentlemen should now conceive such a hatred to it. What did those gentlemen propose to call themselves? Oh! says the Postmaster General, we're the Government of Canada. (Laughter.) Probably that hon. gentleman will hereafter make the great discovery that he has a prescriptive right to the Government of Canada — that in fact it belongs to him, not he to it. (Laughter.)⁴⁴ It is really absurd to observe their anxiety to get rid of a name, and more so when we remember that it was as a coalition they claimed the gratitude of the country. The sole change, so far as he can understand it, appears to be that gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury Benches held certain views which obliged them to resign, and that those views have been changed, in order that they may remain in their places. It was an instance of one of those sudden conversions in politics of which numerous examples have been afforded in these latter days. Ministers resign on Tuesday night, because Upper Canada was against them, and they accept office on Wednesday morning, because Lower Canada is with them. The idea of a Government being formed to oppose an opposition is one of the most original that he had ever heard of. They will no doubt call on the opposition to frame the measures, and if they like them they will adopt them and if not, they will oppose them. Certainly, in that sense it will be one of the most Conservative Governments that ever was formed. The late Premier must evidently have been too dangerous a man for them, boasting of the liberality of their measures, to sit with; and the late Attorney General East must have been decidedly too liberal a man for some of them to sit with.⁴⁵ When they remembered who was Commissioner of Crown Lands, they might understand he was very glad to get rid of the late Att. General for Canada East.⁴⁶

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — No.⁴⁷

MR. GALT. — Especially it might be necessary when they remembered how, on the Ecclesiastical Corporation Bill, the late Att. General East had taken views which had been advocated by Mr. Brown, and which had so horrified gentlemen opposite.⁴⁸ The leadership of the Government is vested in the Attorney General West, and the house cannot forget some circumstances which have occurred during the present session which ought to have some weight in the minds of the Government before they placed that gentleman in that distinguished position. They must have remembered that a committee is now sitting to examine the truth of certain charges made by him against the member for Lambton, and that the friends of the Attorney General themselves stated when that committee was appointed, that if it did not report

against the member for Lambton, the Attorney General West would be unworthy to hold a seat in this house. That committee had not reported yet; but he believed from what he has heard that there is not before that committee a shadow of proof [of] those charges. And what position will the Attorney General stand in then, when he is likely to stand on his trial for one of the most outrageous breaches of decorum ever witnessed in Parliament.⁴⁹ [Such] a person ... was not the best man to be selected as leader of that House.⁵⁰ The Postmaster General is "everything by turns and nothing long;" one day a Radical, the other a Hincksite, and the day after a Nothingarian.⁵¹ (Laughter.)⁵² The new Attorney General is reputed to be very liberal, to be so liberal that he carried his liberalism to the verge of revolution. The definition he gave of himself is, perhaps, the best that can be adopted.⁵³ The present Attorney General East had been pleased to draw his own portrait on a very recent occasion, when he was pleased to inform the House that he was the bull dog of the Administration. (Loud laughter.) He (Mr. Galt) would not be so discourteous as to apply such a term to that hon. gentleman. But he should say that that hon. member certainly displayed one of the characteristics which marked the noble animal alluded to. (Laughter.) One of the characteristics of that noble animal was great tenacity — so that when once it grips it would scarcely ever let go⁵⁴, except perchance when he is pinched in the tail⁵⁵. That characteristic was certainly belonging to the late Provincial Secretary. (Laughter.)⁵⁶ But he was unlike a bull-dog in this: that his bark was worse than his bite. The House would not readily forget how he had closed the long debate on the motion for the want of confidence by a coarse and paltry attack on two or three members of the opposition, which was deemed unworthy of notice by them, and which he would not further refer to now.⁵⁷ He would not occupy the time of the house by defining the position of the Inspector General. He has had his share of attention already in the numerous discussions on his financial policy, on the tariff, and on a great variety of questions, when he was expected to enlighten the house.⁵⁸ (Hear, hear.)⁵⁹ As for the Commissioner of Crown Lands, he had introduced but one bill, as had been remarked by the member for Quebec, the North Shore Railroad bill. The Legislative Council bill did not originate with him, but he accepted it.⁶⁰ If there is one thing for which the late Government, and the present Government, deserve credit, it is for their deference to public opinion — the only instance in which they seem inclined to resist it being where there is a desire exhibited to turn them out of their seats. He would like to hear them explain their position. It appears to him a singular one. They have no policy, no principle. They give no promise of energy in reforming abuses. They have nothing to recommend them to the country, if the house should be dissolved; and he would ask⁶¹, was it possible — considering the past conduct of the Administration, their manner of resignation, without either having given reasons for doing so, or for resuming their seats, considering that they had no policy, in fact, nothing to recommend to the House or the country — was it possible for any hon. gentlemen to unite themselves to a Ministry, which was neither Liberal nor Conservative — nor, in short, anything at all. (Hear, hear.)⁶² He thought not, but that it would receive at the hands of the House the condemnation it deserved.⁶³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY, in replying to the charge of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, ... that the Government[']s explanation] was disjointed and incoherent, ... said that that hon. member thought fit to support his assertions by a reference to explanations made in the other House, where the honorable gentleman uttering them was not in a position to dispute the correctness of the deductions made from his address. As this point would, however, be disposed of by hon. gentlemen possessing a more accurate knowledge of the facts than he (Mr. Cayley) had, he would go on to speak of the charges of incompetency, departmental mismanagement and utter absence of policy or principle, which had been heaped on the present administration.⁶⁴ The member for Sherbrooke had gone over the same ground which had been already worn out day after day and week after week of departmental mismanagement and departmental inefficiency, and which had only a few days since formed the subject of a long and full discussion.⁶⁵ The members of the administration had [then] occasion to complain that gross misstatements had been put forth to their [dis]advantage by the Committee of Public Accounts. Faults of the administration of the departments had been laid upon their shoulders in a disingenuous manner, as if they had originated them.

They had inherited the system of paying Board of Works' certificates from their predecessors. They were left unreformed by the Chairman of the Committee when he was in office. In the report of the Committee no notice was taken of this as a course pursued long ago, even while the Chairman of the Committee was in office, but it was most dishonestly set up as a creation of the coalition ministry. The hon. member charged them with want of political principle and policy⁶⁶ — although that administration had the credit of bringing forward more measures of great public importance than any other since the Province contained an independent administration. But, forsooth, because they were not eternally coming down with new policy, therefore they had none at all.⁶⁷ But he would like to know what was the policy of that gentleman when he first entered the house, in 1849? That hon. gentleman was then a Conservative; but because the Conservative party was then going down, he abandoned them, because there was a very fair prospect of the opposition coming into power.⁶⁸ He attached his fortunes to those of the reformers; but when, in turn, the administration formed out of that party, with Mr. Hincks at its head, began to totter, forthwith the hon. member sent him a note saying, he need no longer look on him as one of his followers.⁶⁹ The hon. gentleman certainly need not charge the government with having no policy. But the hon. member seemed to think it strange that he had not been sent for when the late administration had resigned⁷⁰. Of course, the hon. gentleman had no hopes of being sent for, in thus suddenly shifting his course. But he (Mr. Cayley) would tell that hon. gentleman, and those hon. gentlemen with whom he acted, the reason they were not sent for. Simply because they were a party without a single feeling in common — an Opposition all head and no body.⁷¹ When Messrs. Baldwin and Lafontaine were called in to ... [form an administration]; when Mr. Hincks was called upon; when Sir A. MacNab was called upon; when Col. Tache was called upon, each of them was the recognized chief of a certain party; each had a certain [sic] following in the House.⁷² There was no one on the opposition benches who could be recognized as the leader of a party.... Gentlemen opposite can never expect to be sent for to form an administration until they have the support of a party. He would like any one of them to point out the party by which he is supported.⁷³ Who, among the present opposition, followed and who led? The views of a coming man and his party strength should be known. Would the honorable and learned member for Montreal follow the leadership of the member for Lambton? Did the member for Glengarry or the member for London agree with him or he with them, or with the member for Haldimand? There were not more than half a dozen men among them agreeing together. Suppose the member for Lambton was sent for in what would the member for Montreal support him?⁷⁴ Mr. Brown certainly does not agree with Mr. Holton on the Legislative Council Bill, on annexation, or the question of the Union. Mr. Brown does not agree with Mr. J.S. Macdonald on representation by population. On the dissolution of the Union, Mr. McKenzie is not supported by Mr. Holton, or Mr. Brown. Mr. McKenzie is strongly in favour of free banking, Mr. Holton is strongly opposed to it.⁷⁵ On the financial policy no three of them seemed to agree; on Banking they had recently differed widely; on the Duval question they were not united. The hon. members for Montreal and London both changed their votes, — voting against their expressed opinions for a party purpose. No doubt they were prepared to do so again; to change places with ministers. Would the member for Glengarry agree with the member for Sherbrooke, in this time of scarcity of money, to launch out into new expenditure[s] for the Caughnawaga or the Grand Trunk Railroad, and other public works? Would he agree to a scheme to hand over the canals, to that hon. gentleman and others, with their revenues?⁷⁶

MR. GALT. — What are the revenues?⁷⁷

[MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY:] The public accounts showed a revenue of £100,000 per annum. The statements on the other side of the House, prepared for effect on the occasion — prepared for a purpose, included in the expense of enlargement and improvements of the works under the head of cost of maintenance — in order to show there was no revenue.⁷⁸ On the question of a double majority, is there any agreement among the members of the opposition?⁷⁹

One member, yes!⁸⁰

Another [member]. — No.⁸¹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Yes and No, precisely. That was a good instance of their harmony upon all questions. The subject of double-dealing and insincerity towards Sir Allan MacNab had been broached yesterday and referred to again to-day.⁸² It had been hinted indeed, that they had courted a defeat in order to have an excuse to get rid of him.⁸³ It was, he would venture to assert, in the minds of every hon. gentleman present, how the recent defeat had been accomplished. But no one could be fully cognizant of all the facts connected with it — of the great and untiring exertions made to avoid that defeat by those very honorable gentlemen who were now accused of double-dealing, they had strained every effort to avert the calamitous consequences of the late vote.⁸⁴ Knowing the importance which was attached to that vote on both sides of the house, he had on that occasion asked Sir Allan MacNab to exercise his influence with Mr. Murney, and Mr. Cameron, and other gentlemen, to induce them to withhold their vote of condemnation on that occasion. He told Sir Allan MacNab how much importance was attached to that vote on this side of the house, and how necessary it was, if not to get a majority, at least to tie the votes.⁸⁵ Three votes changed would have made the Upper Canada vote equal. The members for Kingston and Wentworth used every exertion to prevent a defeat, and used such exertions especially to prevent the scandal that they had intrigued against the Premier to save him from their defeat.⁸⁶ But those friends on whom they had relied in consequence of previous concert, previous friendships, and previous professions, failed them, and the consequence was that hostile vote. Now, no one would dare say that that defeat was courted⁸⁷ to enable them to force out the Premier. They had used every exertion to prevent it. They had warned him to use his influence also to prevent it, and he had acted in good faith.⁸⁸ On a previous occasion, when the late Speaker of the Legislative Council had left them, he endeavoured to bring that gentleman back to work with them during the session and put an end to those suspicions and remarks which had been afloat for some time; but that gentleman had again left them, not to return. On that occasion the Postmaster General felt that his ability to remain in the Government was very much shaken, that he had lost the support of a gentleman with whom he had entered the Government; and so keenly did he, and the other members of the administration feel the loss of confidence of the Upper Canada Representatives, more particularly after the strenuous exertions they had made to avoid defeat, that the next morning they handed in their resignations.⁸⁹ The formation of the present Administration had already been fully explained. The hon. gentleman then went on to speak of the financial difficulties, arising from previous arrangements, in which the Province was involved.⁹⁰ There were times when it is a relief to retire from the Government, and release one's self from the responsibility which office devolves upon one. For one, he could say that the extrication of the country from the position in which it was placed by the Grand Trunk Company was a matter likely to afford little satisfaction to any one. The resources of the country were equal to all the liabilities which would have to be incurred, yet the position in which the Province had already been placed towards that Company was most unsatisfactory. They had been asked what was their policy on this point? The Government had early directed their attention towards that subject. They did not let the matter take its course, but had decided on a policy of their own, the first outline of which, submitted in confidence to Mr. Napier, had, by other parties, been made public prematurely.⁹¹ The House was already aware from the public prints, that the Government was desirous to give aid to the Grand Trunk. But he would say he regretted the publication of the first outline or sketch of the scheme of aid entertained by the Government for the Grand Trunk — not that the Government went back from the views they entertained on this point, but that it wanted these details which had been discussed orally and without which the outline must be incomplete; for instance, it had never been the intention of the government to impose on the company any new obligations not embraced in the original contract which they had voluntarily assumed; and in the suggestions with reference to the London and St. Mary's, Port Hope and Lindsay, Cobourg and Peterboro, Prescott and Ottawa, Three Rivers and Arthabaska railways, it was not designed, nor did the memorandum imply any obligation on the company to raise funds to carry on these lines. It was simply a consent on the part of the Province

that a first charge should be placed on the Grand Trunk line generally, in order to enable the company, if they saw fit, and satisfactorily arrange matters with the stockholders, to raise means to place these lines in good working order. If he (Mr. Cayley) was not mistaken, the suggestion for the Three Rivers line, came from the engineer of the Grand Trunk. It was he who pointed out the advantages of a feeder at that section of the Province, in order to open up the rich country to the North. He also pointed out that the neighboring Townships had volunteered to subscribe £75,000 for that purpose.⁹² Not one single member from that section had been consulted on the subject before it was proposed. The London and St. Mary's line also was regarded by the friends of the Grand T. Company, as of the greatest benefit to it. It was so regarded in the debates in Parliament in the session of 1855⁹³, [when] an attempt had been made to make it a part of the line. The three other lines already in existence — from Port Hope to Lindsay, Cobourg to Peterboro and Prescott to Ottawa, required only a small amount to render them efficient: — the Prescott line, £45,000 for ballasting; the Cobourg line, £25,000 for the bridge over Rice Lake, and £35,000 for the Port Hope and Lindsay — in all £100,000. To this extent, the Government were prepared to consent to the imposition of a first charge, should the Company see fit and find themselves in a position to undertake the arrangements. Now, these propositions had not been made at the suggestion of those members interested in the several localities [sic], or to win local support, but simply because it was calculated to render the main line more productive by supplying valuable feeders. Indeed he had reason to believe that the Government, had lost the support of the hon. gentlemen from Victoria and Northumberland, because the proposition had not taken the shape of converting the Municipal Loan Fund debentures, which they had floated into a Provincial guarantee.⁹⁴ But the Government was not prepared to saddle the expense of these lines altogether upon the Province. The completion of these connecting lines was looked upon as a benefit to the Grand Trunk, but it had never been proposed to make their construction obligatory on the company. The Government felt that the only fair way was, for the Province to stand out of the way of those who should loan more money to complete the line.⁹⁵ The next point under discussion was the position which the Provincial guarantee of £3,000,000, was to hold under the new arrangements. In the opinion of the Government, it was not deemed unreasonable to place the bonds of the Province on an equal footing with those of the Company, in regard to interest, sharing *pro rata* in the surplus revenue of the road; any deficiency arising from such an arrangement, during the progress of the works, to be made good by stock.⁹⁶ With respect to the proposed grant of lands for the road from Peterboro to Lake Huron, he did not shrink from taking all responsibility of that act. He believed it a wise mode of disposing of the public domain and increasing the value of the remainder. It is also a part of the scheme to allocate lands to those who would build a road from Canada to New Brunswick. The same policy had been pursued with the happiest results in the States.⁹⁷

SIR A. MACNAB said, in consequence of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat, I wish to say a few words. That hon. gentleman has been a long time in public life, and during the long time he has been in parliament we have generally acted together. I, of course, must thank the hon. gentleman for expressing to this House that it was the desire of himself and his colleagues that as two or three votes would be necessary to retain me in the position which I then held, that I should exercise my influence with certain [sic] parties named. But that hon. gentleman will recollect the report which gained great currency throughout the city, and which was believed by some of my hon. colleagues,⁹⁸ that while Mr. Cameron was in opposition to the late Government, I was in close communication with him. I believe that he was a greater friend of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, than he was of mine; but I think he will not thank his friend for even insinuating that he would be base enough to offer opposition to the Government while he was in communication with its head. The hon. member will recollect the very severe political attacks made upon me in a paper called the *Leader*, because I had answered a letter addressed by Mr. Cameron to me, when he was charged with not acting quite right in the support he gave to the Government. When I wrote that letter, I sent it to Mr. Attorney General Macdonald, who said that he entirely concurred with its sentiments; but, notwithstanding that, I have

been on more than one occasion attacked for my intimacy with Mr. Cameron, but never heard that one of those gentlemen ever got up to defend me. They may have done so, but I am not aware that they did.⁹⁹ If Mr. Cameron were here, at this moment, he would say that I never had a political conversation with him from the vote on the Duval case until the time I sent for him, at the request of the Inspector General, to ask him not to vote against the Government on the occasion of the late vote of want of confidence, as he was about to leave the country. I wrote a letter to him asking him to state if this were not the case. The answer I received was as follows: —

WELLINGTON CHAMBERS, Toronto, May 25, 1856

MY DEAR SIR ALLAN, —

In answer to your note I beg leave to state that from the time of the Duval motion until the time when the estimates containing the £50,000 appropriation for Government Buildings at Quebec was [sic] laid on the table of the House, I had no discussion or conversation with you on political subjects, either in reference to your Government or your own personal views or those of any of your colleagues, and that on the latter occasion, I simply informed you, having called on you for that purpose, that I should vote against the estimates, and for Mr. Papin's motion, as by the course the administration were pursuing, I had no confidence in them as a whole, whatever confidence I might still have in some individuals comprising it. You are at liberty to make any use of this note that you may think proper.

Yours faithfully,

J. HILLYARD CAMERON.

The Hon. Sir Allan McNab.

I think my hon. friend Mr. Gamble was present at the time and I expressed the same views to him as to Mr. Cameron. I endeavored to urge him to change his views.¹⁰⁰ I thought he might exercise influence enough with his friends to prevent what has taken place from occurring. I also asked Mr. Murney to come to my house;¹⁰¹ he said he would — but he did not come. Mr. Murney subsequently told me that he was about to leave the House and was met by a friend who detained him, and not knowing that I wanted him particularly in reference to that vote he called up on the following day, when it was all over.¹⁰² I think it necessary to make these statements in consequence of what has been said. They are perfectly true, and such as no hon. member can gainsay. I have already expressed my regret that from the very severe illness with which I have been afflicted, I have been unable to appear in the house. I desire no concealment, and I wish that everything that I have done should be known from one end of the country to the other. I hardly thought my hon. friend would have brought up a matter of this kind. I scarcely thought that when he asked me to use my influence with Mr. Murney and Mr. Cameron, that he would have brought it up to-day, because it might be considered as a violation of friendly confidence.¹⁰³ I do not think it quite fair because if it means anything at all it must mean that I can exercise such an influence over these gentlemen as to cause them to vote contrary to their convictions.¹⁰⁴ I believe that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has just as large an influence with Mr. Cameron, and has enjoyed his friendship as much as I ever did. If any one could have induced Mr. Cameron to change his opinion, that hon. gentleman could have done it better than I could.¹⁰⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — I must have been misunderstood by the hon. and gallant Knight, if he could have drawn from any remarks of mine any such idea as that which he has expressed, even of the most indistinct kind. I was merely relating the several steps taken to avert that defeat which we are charged with having brought about for our own purposes. I speak of points within the knowledge of many hon. members, when I say that I went to other parties, for the very purpose of showing the importance I attach to the vote given the other night; that I left no stone unturned to avert that defeat. I did not go to Mr. Cameron because he was my friend,¹⁰⁶ and therefore ... could not appeal to him unless with the appearance of asking his vote in personal friendship.¹⁰⁷ Nor would I have done so had it been specially for myself, but on this occasion I thought I could point out the importance of the vote¹⁰⁸, [and I] urged the premier to use his influenc[e] with the hon. member for Toronto¹⁰⁹; and the only reason why I alluded

to this matter, was to show the efforts I made to prevent the government from being defeated.¹¹⁰ He [Mr. Cayley] did not think any one could have misunderstood him. He believed that in a question of this kind between friends, ... no political feeling nor party spirit would for a moment intervene to prevent justice being done between two old friends.¹¹¹

SIR A. MACNAB said — No man regrets more than I do, that any difficulty should arise between old friends. I think that everybody in Upper Canada knows this, that whatever my faults may have been, whatever I have been guilty of, I have generally stood by my friends. I hold that nothing should part a man from his friends but death or villany. But if I were to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I was satisfied with the course pursued towards me, I would be a hypocrite, and I would be telling you what I did not believe. (Hear, hear.) I am ready to defend myself. I wish to do so, but I wish to do nothing more¹¹². There was a slight error in Col. Tache's statement.¹¹³ The Attorney General was not the first to signify his intention of resigning. It was the Postmaster General. When the Council at their last session charged me to place their resignations in the hands of His Excellency, they proposed that I should advise His Excellency to send for Col. Tache to reconstruct the Cabinet. My reply was that I did not think we were in a position to offer His Excellency any advice. But I obeyed the instructions of my colleagues, and I stated to His Excellency what my late colleagues directed me to do. With regard to the question put by hon. gentlemen opposite, as to how the Governor General became acquainted with the resignation of these hon. gentlemen as stated in the explanation read to the House yesterday, I must say I am rather taken aback by it, because I think it was perfectly well understood¹¹⁴ the day before the vote was taken what course should be adopted in case of a defeat. The council met to decide as to the course they should pursue. I think the thing was understood, but I would rather that those gentlemen should state it themselves. I have perfect recollection of [the] facts. I recollect an hon. gentleman stating that it was time to give his opinion when the vote took place. Others said it would be better to have an understanding in case of a defeat taking place. I stated to his Excellency that the three gentlemen named would persist in their determination to resign, and I think I was right in doing so. I cannot tell whether they expressed their intention to resign, but I knew that if they were defeated they intended to do so, and I thought it right to inform his Excellency of what was going on.¹¹⁵

MR. GALT. — I would like to ask, with regard to the memorandum read by his Excellency, which intimated a foreknowledge of these resignations, how that knowledge was obtained?¹¹⁶

SIR A. MACNAB. — I believe that the Governor read it in Council after I had written to him.¹¹⁷

MR. GALT. — I wish to know whether any advice was tendered to his Excellency except by the whole Council.¹¹⁸

SIR A. MACNAB. — It is quite competent for those gentlemen to say whether they had given any advice to his Excellency.¹¹⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The hon. member for Sherbrooke has adverted to the embarrassment under which I spoke last night, it was from a physical disability, and arising from a sore throat, and I trust the house will bear with me under these circumstances. I must say that the embarrassment was physical and did not arise from any fear as to the course I had taken.¹²⁰ The hon. member for Sherbrooke had alluded to the speech made by the head of the Upper House, in reference to the recent changes, and had said that it was more explan[a]tory than any made in this House. He (Mr. Macdonald) had read that speech, and had found it both full and accurate, as any one who was acquainted with the head of the Upper House could not but have expected. But there was one error in that speech as appeared to him (Mr. Macdonald,) and that was, that he (Mr. Macdonald) was represented to have spoken first in the Council Chamber in the residence of Sir Allan MacNab. That was a mis-statement,¹²¹ as the

Postmaster General was the first to resign, and I say at once, as far as I am concerned — and so far as I have heard with regard to others it is the same — that I have had no previous communication with his Excellency, nor did I inform him that I would adopt any course whatever in the event of an adverse Upper Canadian vote in this house. In a matter of so much importance it is natural to suppose that besides the formal Councils, that among colleagues the course they ought to take, unless otherwise advised, would be a matter of conversation. I say that, before going to Sir Allan McNab, I had ascertained that it was the feeling of the Postmaster General, that under the circumstances his position would be extremely prejudiced by the action of his friends in this vote. He did not, however, convey at any meeting of the Council, what his intentions were. So far was that gentleman from intimating the course that he would take, that the day before the Council, ... he said it would be when we met in Council, at Sir Allan McNab's house. The Postmaster General said expressly that he would consider what course he would take, when the contingency arrived. He guarded himself from being supposed to have made up his mind as to what course he should take. The vote was adverse as far as Upper Canada was concerned, and the next thing I knew of it was, that in speaking to my colleagues on the position of affairs, the Postmaster General felt that his position would be very seriously affected. I also stated to him, and I presume, to others, that if Mr. Spence and Mr. Morrison retired, in the present constitution of the house, the Government could not stand.¹²² The hon. Inspector General also thought that the present constitution could not stand, and the last Council was held at Sir Allan's residence next day. At that Council¹²³, Mr. Spence gave the reason he stated last night, why he should resign. Mr. Morrison followed him, as belonging to the same party. I then expressed my views as to the ground on which I ought to resign. In the first place I adhered to the ground that the double majority was not a constitutional principle, but I thought that after the vote of the day before, we could not have any satisfactory assurance that we should be able to conduct the Government with the vigour that was necessary.¹²⁴ The majority of the Upper Canadiaa [sic] members being against the Ministry, as it then was, statements appeared in the city papers charging the Government with being swayed and governed by Lower Canadian influence. And he (Mr. McDonald) found that a series of such votes was sufficient to destroy any Government. He (Mr. Macdonald) was aware, at the time that the position adopted by Mr. Baldwin, would be used against the Government by the press, and that eventually it would have the effect of destroying the position of the Government.¹²⁵ The result was that Sir Allan MacNab wrote a note to his Excellency, requesting him to come up to his house. The Governor General came to the Council and produced the paper he read yesterday, at which I was rather surprised, as I had not communicated my intention to his Excellency in any way whatever.¹²⁶ [I] presumed that the information was given by Sir Allan either by some conversation or by his note. It might have been in consequence of the note, although from the shortness of the time that elapsed, I thought it most likely that the information was given in the informal way I had spoken of. Immediately after his Excellency came up the note was read. We had some little discussion, and we then urged our intentions of resigning.¹²⁷ The hon. gentleman here alluded to a statement of Sir Allan in reference to not giving advice to His Excellency. Several gentlemen on the other side quoted extracts from the report of Col. Tache's speech in the *Leader*, to show that the hon. gentleman was mistaken. He then went on to say that he had no objection to have [sic] his attention drawn to the subject.¹²⁸ [He did] not remember when it was suggested that the Speaker of the Upper House should be sent for.¹²⁹ He did not hear the Hon. and Gallant Knight say — he did not think they were then in a position to tender their advice about the person to be sent for — of course if the Hon. and Gallant Knight said so, he might be mistaken. The matter was otherwise of no importance, but that the hon. member for Sherbrooke had said a good deal about the advice being given by individuals to His Excellency apart from their action in Council.¹³⁰ He did not think that the Postmaster General gave any advice to his Excellency or in fact any advice at all.¹³¹ None had been so given even in this case, ... though technically, it might be liable to objection of that sort being given after their resignation, but it was given unitedly.¹³² The hon. gentleman then went on to refer to the first formation of the coalition, and spoke of the course that was proposed by the conservative members of the house with regard to the Clergy Reserve question.¹³³ At the time that the late Government had been

formed at Quebec, when Sir Allan was sent for to form a ministry, he (Sir Allan) found that although he commanded a large party in the House of what were called Conservatives, yet, acting alone with Lower Canada, which had an assurance of a majority, the course that he could best adopt would be to form a Coalition Administration, and in consequence of the opinions expressed by ministers then (himself among the rest) the position taken by those ministers that resigned could not be called a hasty resolution to get office¹³⁴. There had been a resolution come to by that party, that if the declaration of the country on the Clergy reserves was against them, they would yield to that expression of opinion when the Government was formed, — that it was no new idea on their part — no abandonment of principle for the sake of getting office, if they accepted that measure at the hands of reformers. It was a pre-arrangement determined on by a majority of the conservatives remaining in Quebec after the previous session of Parliament broke up. That Government so formed went on until the other day.¹³⁵ He (Mr. Macdonald) did not seek to patch up coalitions. He would reiterate, that the course of action pursued towards Sir Allan was not a sudden one; but in consequence of a previously arranged plan, when the coalition was formed under Sir Allan.¹³⁶

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair, it being six o'clock.¹³⁷

After the recess,¹³⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD continued to remark on the circumstances of the formation of the Coalition Government¹³⁹. The hon. and gallant Knight had had no difficulty in forming that administration, and called in to assist him the Hon. Postmaster General and the Honorable John Ross; because, consenting to accept that measure [the Clergy Reserves], they found little else on which they disagreed.¹⁴⁰ The gallant knight brought a certain strength from one set of supporters, and the Postmaster General brought a certain amount of strength from another set of supporters. In reference to its breaking up, there were certain points which he had not yet got permission to explain. But if on any particular point explanation was sought, he would either give it or state the reason why he could not. When the hon. Mr. Ross this session retired from the Government, he put it on the ground of the message he had received from the Reform supporters of the Government, that the time might come when they might feel called upon to withdraw their confidence. Mr. Ross considered that that amounted to a giving way of one of the bases on which the Coalition Government had been formed, and resigned. The Postmaster General took a different ground, as did he (Mr. Macdonald) ... that having enjoyed the confidence of the House, they should receive from the House an expression of the withdrawal of its confidence before they resigned. But afterwards, the loss of the support of his Reform friends having been authoritatively indicated in the House on the vote of last week, the Postmaster General took the same course as his former colleague Mr. Ross had taken.¹⁴¹ There was this strong ground for believing that they are in the right, and that is, that a Coalition Government is formed different from a party Government. Those gentlemen were not called on to resign office, seeing that a large majority of the House wished them to retain office.¹⁴² A party Government might go on, if it had a working majority of the whole House, although a vote of one section of the Province was recorded against it, as a party had a living principle in itself which might enable it again to gain the ascendancy. But with a Coalition Government it was different, for the very bases on which it was formed had been struck away, and on the Postmaster General accepting the verdict of this House as a ground for resignation, and the Receiver General taking the same course, he (Mr. Macdonald) thought it his duty to retire also, because he considered the Government of the country could not be successfully carried on. The Inspector General retired because the others did. The gallant Premier took the ground that, totally disapproving of the double majority principle, he would do nothing that could be construed into an admission on his part of that doctrine, but he stated that his office was at the disposal of the Governor General. Being satisfied that there was no security that the Government could be carried

on with that vigor which was necessary, in the exercise of his discretion, he (Mr. Macdonald) handed in his resignation. The gallant knight stated yesterday that his Excellency asked him if he could fill up the places of those who retired. It was quite within his power to have done so, had he thought proper. But he presumed he did not make the attempt because he was satisfied that a Government could not be carried on, if it had only the support of the Conservatives of Upper Canada, joined to the Lower Canada support. But the gallant knight stated yesterday emphatically that he did not make the attempt, and that he had had no communication with hon. gentlemen opposite, with a view to enlisting Reform support. The Premier having stated to his Excellency that he could not form a Government, of course some Government must be formed, and then the suggestion was made that the Speaker of the Legislative Council should be sent for, as the chief of the Lower Canada section of the Government, which had been sustained by a very large majority from that section.¹⁴³ The question of sending for the Speaker of the Upper House to form a ministry, was explained by the fact that it was the duty of the Governor General in such an emergency, to call upon the man most likely to be able to form a strong party. And as a large majority of the votes on the occasion of the vote of Want of Confidence were from Lower Canada, it showed that Lower Canada had a majority in the House. Therefore the Premier should be chosen from the party who had a majority. As in the cases where Mr. Baldwin and Sir Allan McNab were premiers, there was an Upper Canada head and a Lower Canada head to the Administration.¹⁴⁴ The principle that the Government should have two heads had always been acted on, and in the elevation of Mr. Morin to the Bench, Col. Tache had been the acknowledged chief of the Lower Canada interest. Col. Tache having been selected by his Excellency to form a Government, put himself in communication with him (Mr. M.) supposing he presumed that he was the fittest person to put himself in communication with, after the assurances he had received from a number of members of this House of the undiminished confidence they reposed in him.¹⁴⁵ He had some things to say with reference to the late Attorney General East; but he was sorry that he was not in his place to answer for himself.¹⁴⁶ The Attorney General was going on to explain why the post of leader of the Government in this House was assigned to him rather than to Mr. Drummond¹⁴⁷ —

MR. FELTON remarked that Mr. Drummond would shortly be present, and it would be better to postpone those remarks till he came.¹⁴⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD in that case would refrain until he was in his place. The party that would govern the country could only be successful, who could join together in heart and hand. He agreed with the member for Quebec, when he said that parties could not be done away with. But at the same time he saw no reason why parties should be separated on trivial matters, when no great principle separates them. He had the strongest assurance from both Conservative and Reform ranks that, although formerly they were hostile to each other, yet that now they were prepared to act together¹⁴⁹, and wished to aid in such a junction. The proposition for it came, as he understood, from the Conservative party of the supporters of the Government, and he approved of it, because he thought it would lead to the formation of a new party.¹⁵⁰ The new Government was to be supported by a new party composed of Liberal Conservatives and Conservative Liberals, who were now able to join together, the questions which formerly separated them having been settled.¹⁵¹ He (Mr. Macdonald) had the satisfaction of being told by conservative gentlemen that he was as liberal as gentlemen calling themselves reformers. These were the reasons that induced him (Mr. McD.) to act as he had done: to join the new administration, and to seek for the confidence of the House. The vote on the motion before the House would show whether he possessed its confidence or not, and if not he would be prepared to act accordingly. He had one more subject to speak of before he sat down, and that was the appointment of Mr. Vankoughnet to the presidency of the Council.¹⁵² In asking Mr. Vankoughnet to come into the Government, he had done so after having thoroughly conversed with him and ascertained what his views were¹⁵³, but he would not dwell on them now, as that gentleman would soon have an opportunity of explaining them himself in the

house.¹⁵⁴ Mr. Vankoughnet, after fully considering the case, and understanding the position of parties in this House, and the complete accord which existed among hon. gentlemen formerly separated into different departments of the body politic, felt that he could go in and carry out Liberal measures, just as well as could hon. gentlemen opposite.¹⁵⁵

MR. MACKENZIE. — What are those Liberal measures?¹⁵⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — All those measures which the member for Haldimand votes against.¹⁵⁷ It would be useless for him (Mr. McD.) to go over in detail all the measures, as the hon. Inspector General had ably dealt with all in detail, and showed what the government intended to do in all the public works. As to the future acts of the government,¹⁵⁸ the member for Sherbrooke attacked the Government for not coming down with a bill of fare, with a "platform," to use an Americanism and an innovation on our constitution¹⁵⁹. He would like to know from those gentlemen what those great measures are that they expect. One hon. gentleman stated that the ministry do nothing but look to the opposition for all their measures. If such was the case, then they had a very poor bill of fare indeed.¹⁶⁰ But he did not think it the duty of the Government to initiate measures. Great questions generally originated with some individual, and when they fully took hold of the public mind, then was the time for the Government to take them up and either oppose or adopt them.¹⁶¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — What measures did Mr. Baldwin commence when out of Parliament?¹⁶²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Well, in England great measures were proposed out of Parliament by books and speeches.¹⁶³ But no hon. gentleman on the other side had ever attempted to introduce any measure which the Government could steal.¹⁶⁴

MR. SANBORN. — You stole the Audit Bill.¹⁶⁵

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The Audit Bill was prepared with great care by the Inspector General, and he did not derive much assistance in the task from the resolution or bill of Mr. Darche. The reference of the member for Compton to that measure as the only one the Opposition could claim was not very fortunate.¹⁶⁶

MR. SANBORN. — I referred to it, because the Inspector General said it was the best bill introduced by the Administration.¹⁶⁷

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD quite agreed that the Bill of the Inspector General was one of the best of the Administration. All he could say was that the Inspector General acted as best he could to get a sufficient support in the House for the measures of the Government, and a declaration of confidence, and they took such steps as they could to counteract the formidable attacks of the Opposition.¹⁶⁸ One thing more he wished to say in reply to the gallant knight; that gentleman had said he had been frequently attacked, but no one had defended him.¹⁶⁹ He was not aware that the honorable and gallant Knight had ever been attacked in his absence by any hon. member, and it was quite competent for the honorable and gallant Knight if he thought proper, to get explanations as to anything which appeared in the columns of the press reflecting upon him, or if he thought that any attacks were made upon him in the House by any hon. member he could have demanded explanations. As he now saw the Attorney General East (Mr. Drummond) in the House, he would make the statement he had deferred making till his arrival.¹⁷⁰ His remarks were of a similar nature to those made by the Speaker of the Upper House on a late occasion.¹⁷¹ When the question arose as to who should be selected for Premier and who for Leader of the Government in this House, he (Mr. Macdonald) stated that in his opinion whoever should be

selected as Premier from either Upper or Lower Canada — that whichever section the Premier came from, the leader should be selected from the other section. The Atty. General East did not approve of that arrangement,¹⁷² thinking that he had a personal claim upon the post from his seniority. He (Mr. McD.), however, declined to give up the post, because he had precedent in his favour, because he was supported by his colleagues and because he believed that it would¹⁷³, if carried out, only have added to the cry which was frequently brought forward by the opposition press, that Lower Canada ruled at one end of the building and Upper Canada at the other. But he did not question at all the abilities of the Attorney General East as a lawyer, or the discretion he used in the absence of the hon. and gallant Knight in bringing forward measures. He could only say with all sincerity, that he had always had the greatest pleasure in acting privately and politically with the Attorney General East, and he should have been but too happy had that hon. gentleman been in the Government now, but he did not think that the position proposed by the hon. gentleman upon the occasion he now alluded to would have been satisfactory, and upon that ground he did not agree with the hon. gentleman changing his position.¹⁷⁴ He thought that it would have been a slur on Upper Canada if two Lower Canadian leaders had been chosen. The same thing would apply to Lower Canada supposing that two Upper Canadians had been chosen. This was all the explanation that he (Mr. McD.) had to give as to his conduct.¹⁷⁵ He wished to make one explanation as to the first meeting which took place in Quebec of the Conservative party, called by the hon. and gallant Knight about the time of the prorogation.¹⁷⁶ The great point that the conservatives desired to get away was the elective principle. The Clergy Reserves Act had been enforced; but he was not sure about the elective principle.¹⁷⁷ The Elective Legislative Council Bill was not one that agitated the country then, although it had done for years¹⁷⁸. The principle of election was not so strong at that time as to warrant its introduction; but the Clergy Reserves was the all-important question at that time. He would not be positive as to the elective principle at all. He had explained to Sir Allan at the time about the matter.¹⁷⁹

MR. GAMBLE had understood the hon. gentleman to remark that at that meeting the Conservative party gave way upon the latter measure.¹⁸⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD contradicted this.¹⁸¹

MR. GAMBLE said that what passed at that time was after the prorogation.¹⁸² [He] understood it to have been agreed upon at that meeting by the Conservative party, that the Clergy Reserves [sic] Bill should no longer be considered as a test question among the party, but an open one, and that no member of the party should be ostracised for adopting such [a] course as he deemed proper upon it, and he thought that upon that occasion, Sir A. McNab admitted, that if it was ascertained that the country was in favor of Secularization of the Reserves that he would no longer oppose it. Then as to the second meeting which occurred, he did not think that anything was said about a Coalition Ministry or anything connected with it, or that any particular course with regard to the Clergy Reserves was indicated there, but there was a direct allusion made by himself (Mr. Gamble) to applying the elective principle to the Legislative Council.¹⁸³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD was of opinion that at that meeting the leadership of Sir Allan was agreed upon; each member securing to himself the right to vote against the Clergy Reserves. But he was not sure what action was taken as to the elective principle.¹⁸⁴

MR. DRUMMOND, after stating that his absence from the House had been owing to severe indisposition, proceeded to explain his position. He would go back to the time when the vote was recorded in the House, giving a majority of 23 in favor of the Administration of which he formed a part. Three of the gentlemen representing Upper Canada thought that the vote given by Upper Canadians was a distinct condemnation of their conduct by the gentlemen whom they more particularly represented, and they with a sense of honor which did them credit, admitted that the confidence which their friends had in them

would be lost if they continued to remain in the Government. The Postmaster General in particular stated, that when he consented to take a share in the Coalition Government, he did so because he found at his back a considerable number of followers, and that at that moment he found himself abandoned afterwards by some five or six, and he (Mr. D.) could appreciate the feeling of that hon. gentleman which led him to take the course he did, and he could appreciate also the feelings which led the Attorney General West (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Morrison) to withdraw, though he could not admit that he could appreciate the feelings which led the Postmaster-General to resign because he had not so many followers as he had at the beginning of the Session, which he could not have had if the distinction between Conservatives and Reformers was to be kept up; but he (Mr. Drummond) was of opinion from the outset, that if that Government was to be carried on with success, a termination should be put to that distinction. (Hear, hear.) He had implored his colleagues to do away with such distinctions, and to forget past differences, and to try and unite all parties upon some broad platform upon which they could look forward to the future with bright hopes, and forget all the discords of the past. (Hear, hear.) And he told his colleagues "if you think that Sir Allan McNab stands in your way, go up to him all together and tell him so." (Hear, hear.) He had acted with them heart and hand, never had betrayed them in one instance, but had endeavoured to put an end to all feuds between them in their own camp. He would have liked them to have gone into Council upon any differences which existed among themselves, and to have submitted the result of their conclusions to him and his friends. But at the end of the session, when important measures had to be disposed of, he was most anxious that it should not be said that the session had been concluded without any important measure except the Legislative Elective Council Bill having been passed.¹⁸⁵ He knew, too, that the great enterprize of the country — the Grand Trunk — was trembling in the balance.¹⁸⁶ The Ministry at the beginning of the session had every obstacle in their way, but he was willing to make every sacrifice in order that important measures should be carried through. With all the great considerations then floating before him, he implored his hon. friends not to resign. He said that they were backed by a majority of the House, and that the confidence of the House should be looked to. (Hear, hear.) At the same time he then repudiated most distinctly the idea of systematically governing any one section of this country by a majority from either section. (Hear, hear.) He said, that no statesman would ever think of resigning a great measure which was calculated to do good to the whole country, because of a majority of one section of the country being against them in it. He considered that at a moment when the Ministry were backed by a majority of the whole House, they should proceed with the business of the country to the end of the session, but at the conclusion thereof look to their strength, and if they had not got confidence in it, resign; that when, after expressing these views to his colleagues, he found that they were determined to resign at once, he felt himself placed very awkwardly, he must confess. Of course, when the Premier resigned, he held in his hands all their commissions. His colleagues resigned too. When Col. Tache was called upon to form a Ministry, he (Mr. D.) certainly felt reluctant to join it, unless he could be assured that the position which these gentlemen had taken, with regard to the necessity of having a strong support from their friends, could be carried out by the new organization, (hear, hear;) and therefore, thinking as he did, he considered himself as being entirely out of the Ministry. He considered that he was entitled to append to his acceptance of office any conditions that he thought fit, and he stated to his hon. friend the Attorney General West what his impressions were. He (Mr. D.) was never consulted as to the gentleman who should be brought into the Ministry from Upper Canada. In answer to what had been asserted about his (Mr. D.'s) pretensions in stating conditions upon which he would accept office, he did not feel that he had made any pretensions. He had entered into no altercation with the Attorney General West upon the matter. He had said in reply to remarks that fell, that he (Mr. D.) did not mean to dispute any claim which Upper Canadians might have, but he merely wished to abide by the conditions under which he consented to hold office. Now he had the confidence to say that he would not join that Ministry, from having been informed by Col. Tache the day before that some one of his colleagues entertained strong prejudices against him. Of course he could not brook the idea of sitting down beside such gentlemen upon the ministerial benches.

He had always acted in the most friendly manner towards them, but could not entertain the idea of sitting with them after such a declaration; accordingly he resigned. (Hear, hear.) But had he been informed that there was an organization about to be completed, which would probably last — which would secure the great objects of the country, and carry out those great administrative and legislative reforms which we have had in view so many years past in Lower Canada — there was no sacrifice which he believed he could not have made. He only learnt the arrangements which had been made by Upper Canadians a few minutes before he had discovered that Col. Tache had agreed that the Attorney General West should be the Leader in the House. The day before Col. Tache had placed himself in communication with the Attorney General West, and Col. Tache called upon him (Mr. D.) the next morning, and he (Mr. D.) asked that hon. gentleman “what progress was being made for reorganization in Upper Canada.” He replied that “he could not tell, but that he had left the whole matter in the hands of the Attorney General West.” He (Mr. D.) said in reply that such was not a right course to pursue¹⁸⁷, for he believed that Lower Canada had as much interest in these arrangements as Upper Canada.¹⁸⁸ He (Mr. D.) only wished it now to be understood that he had no communication of what was to be done, except that the Attorney General West mentioned to him, while walking up to the House, the fact that Mr. Vankoughnet was called in, but he (Mr. D.) did not then know to what place he was elected, how his election was to be secured, or anything about the arrangement, until a few minutes afterwards, when he discovered that Col. Tache had misunderstood entirely the conditions upon which he (Mr. D.) declined office, and there the matter ended. Col. Tache, the Provincial Secretary, and the Commissioners for Crown Lands and Public Works, all called upon him and urged him strongly to accept office; and the Provincial Secretary said that if he declined, he would also do so; but he (Mr. Drummond) told him that he did not see any reason for that — that there were a number of other lawyers in the House besides him, who could be selected — Messrs. Turcotte, Terrill, Loranger, and Polette. He never dreamt of a possibility of coming before the House to declare that he could have confidence in a Government so organized as this present [one] was. He would not speak about Upper Canada. He thought that under our present system it was almost impossible for them to conduct the Government otherwise than by choosing a Ministry from Upper Canada, which would be acceptable to the people of Upper Canada. As to the personal qualities of the gentlemen from Upper Canada in the Ministry, he must say that he knew none of greater talent in that House, and experience in public life; and although possessing a high appreciation of qualifications possessed by certain hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada he could not forbear passing this compliment, but he regretted to declare that he did not think this Ministry would meet with the approbation of the people of Lower Canada.¹⁸⁹ [There was] among them ... no member capable from his experience in legislation to carry forward the reforms required in Lower Canada.¹⁹⁰ He told Col. Tache and the Provincial Secretary that although willing to assist them in carrying out their measures, (especially those in which he had taken a large share himself) that it would be impossible for him to express in the presence of the House and the country his confidence in the Ministry. He might be allowed to make a few further remarks in the course of the evening in relation more particularly to the question before the House. His chief object now was to set himself right before the House upon the subject.¹⁹¹

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON rose to reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Shefford.¹⁹² [He] did not intend to enter at length into the explanations that had been offered. There was but one fact to which he would allude.¹⁹³ When the hon. and gallant Knight gave his example [sic], he said that he had declared that upon the proposition being made by the other members of the Administration, to invite the Governor General to send for Col. Tache, he dissented, saying that they were not in a condition to give advice. He (Mr. Cauchon) recollected the hon. gentleman then enquiring whether the Administration were unanimous in this opinion. Their answer was in the affirmative. But they were unanimous in sending for Col. Tache. But the hon. member for Shefford had just now stated, that there was not in Col. Tache or in any of the Administration, those qualities which could command the confidence of the House.¹⁹⁴

MR. DRUMMOND begged the hon. gentleman would not misrepresent him. What he did state was, that there was no gentleman of sufficient Legislative experience in the Lower Canada section of the Administration to carry out those great reforms which the country required.¹⁹⁵

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON could not agree with the statement. Col. Tache had been a long time in public life. There were other members of that Government too, who had been ten or twelve years in public life. It was strange however, that this sad defect in Administrative ability had only now been discovered by that gentleman. He had sat in Council with the members of the Government for the last 16 months, and during that time he had never made any such complaints. He (Mr. Cauchon) had been brought into the Cabinet at the suggestion of the late Attorney General East. It was certainly rather unfortunate that it was not until a difficulty had arisen that the discovery should have been made that the Government was without ability.¹⁹⁶

MR. DRUMMOND again complained that he was being misrepresented.¹⁹⁷ He did not wish to depreciate the capacity of any one hon. gentleman in particular¹⁹⁸. The hon. gentleman [sic] possessed administrative abilities, and as adjuncts in a Government were every way qualified;¹⁹⁹ but he had said that there was not one single man among them all who possessed that experience in legislation which would enable them to satisfy the House or²⁰⁰ who could inspire the country with confidence in the Lower Canadian section of the Ministry.²⁰¹

Hear, hear, from the Opposition benches.²⁰²

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON understood the cheers of the Opposition; but he was not to be driven from his position by them. The question was one simply of fact, and as such it should be met. He was not there to say that the members of the Cabinet each possessed all that versatility of talent necessary to carry on the Government. But he would like to impress this House with the fact that up to the late disagreement, the lack of talent on the part of the Government had not been discovered. He acknowledged the eminent abilities of the late Attorney General East, and his peculiar fitness for the office of leader of the House. But he believed Col. Tache was entitled to precedence. He would be glad to see his late colleague back in his place²⁰³. Down to the moment of the resignation of Mr. Drummond, all had agreed with that gentleman, and he [Mr. Cauchon] declared that for his own part he had always entertained the greatest confidence in him²⁰⁴. If he had no confidence in the late Attorney General, he would not have sat four minutes in Council with him. He had made every exertion to keep that hon. gentleman in the Government, and had solicited those of his colleagues in whom that gentleman had the most confidence, to use their influence for the same purpose.²⁰⁵ He believed his objection should not have been persisted in.²⁰⁶ He thought it would have been no humiliation to that gentleman to remain in the Government, for he took this view of the question: If the Premier of the Government²⁰⁷ had been chosen from Upper Canada, having a seat in the Upper House,²⁰⁸ and the leader of the House was an Upper Canadian, such an arrangement would have been most distasteful to the Lower Canadian section of the Cabinet, because it would have placed them in the third position. And if Lower Canada would consent to that, it was very improbable that Upper Canada would consent to take the third position.²⁰⁹ It would be unreasonable for Lower Canadians to make any such demand. As a public man he had the attacks of his political adversaries to ward off[f]; and he had even been accused by his friends of deceiving them on a recent occasion. But he had lived through these difficulties. The only question of difference was as to who should be the leader in the Lower House, and he thought this a very extraordinary cause for the withdrawal of confidence.²¹⁰ He was very proud of the leadership of the late Attorney General East; and had the highest respect for his talents, and would be happy to see him in his place, but he could not refuse the leadership of the Attorney General West, as that refusal might have endangered the safety of the party. When they came to decide on the leadership in the House, and when everything else was settled, he thought he must agree with the Premier on that point.²¹¹

MR. DRUMMOND. — Does the Commissioner of Crown Lands mean to say that I did not state the condition, that I should have the leadership of the House?²¹²

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON did not deny the fact. When the question of the leadership was taken up, they had not reflected on the position of Upper Canada; but when they came to that question there was no difference on other grounds.²¹³

MR. DRUMMOND asked if the Commissioner of Crown Lands meant to say that he had bound himself to accept any organization of the Cabinet?²¹⁴ He had only accepted the Lower Canada arrangements provisionally, without knowing anything of those for Upper Canada.²¹⁵ The leadership in the Lower House he had opposed [sic] as a condition before consenting to enter into the arrangements at all; and he had distinctly reserved to himself the right to consider the arrangements when completed. He had further noted down certain questions which he would require should be definitely settled before he would consent to join the Government. The Grand Trunk and North Shore Railway, and Seat of Government policy, he would require should be definitely fixed before he would give in his adhesion to the Cabinet.²¹⁶

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON was surprised at the explanation of the hon. gentleman. The Lower Canada section of the Administration had met together, and agreed to go back as a whole to the Government, and it was agreed to by every one of them. He was astonished to hear now that there was any hesitation, because he thought that before they agreed to go back as a whole, those points which the hon. gentleman had noted should have been laid before the Council. The leadership of the House was the last point that arose, and everything was settled up to that point. There were no differences as to the legislation to be brought before the House. They resolved to adhere to the policy of the previous Government²¹⁷, of which Mr. Drummond was himself a member, and could he now object to the principles and policy to which he had before given his assent?²¹⁸ The hon. gentleman declared at the outset that he had adhered to a certain scheme; and surely, if that was the case, he was still bound to support that scheme when he came before the House. For his own part, he would say that if the measures which had been agreed on in Council were not to be placed before the House by the Government, he would not remain in the Government for five seconds. He could only say that he regretted exceedingly that the hon. gentleman had no confidence in the Government, as it now relates to Lower Canada. He regretted exceedingly the feeling which had induced him to withdraw from the Government because he felt that a position to which he thought he was entitled was not conceded to him, but he could not conceive that the position of the Government in reference to the legislation of this House is at all changed.²¹⁹ The questions introduced by that Government, the late Attorney General East was bound on fairness to support, and if he could not consent to accord in the administration his full confidence, he should at least allow them to carry through those measures to which he had himself assented. The question of disagreement was one of a purely personal character, not of a political nature, and the Government had a right to look for the support of the late Attorney General East, in carrying out the policy of the previous administration.²²⁰ In reply to the member for Montreal, who had accused him of illiberality, he said that if to sacrifice every principle was liberality, he confessed that he was illiberal. On the other hand,²²¹ that hon. gentleman to show his liberality, had yielded the interests of Lower Canada to the views of the member for Lambton, for the sake of office. He was aware that the member opposite had extended ideas.²²² Then, turning to Mr. Galt, he said that in the Crown Lands Committee last year there were some witnesses who spoke in favor of giving all the Crown Lands to a public company. The hon. member had also, in 1849, as a member of Parliament made a wonderful speech about the indemnity bill in the market-hall of Montreal. He was then very loyal — but he became an annexationist soon after. Since then, he made a very loyal speech about the soldiers in the Crimea²²³; and now he was with the annexation party again.²²⁴ Now, if that gentleman taunted him with his changes he might retaliate, but he declined. That gentleman was no worse than his neighbors, but ready to be anything if he only got power.²²⁵

MR. GALT said that the speech spoken of by Mr. Cauchon was so highly conservative that it was specially approved of by Lord Elgin in one of his despatches. Of other matters he need say nothing, as his opinions had been tolerably well known.²²⁶

MR. FELTON, being about to give a vote different from what he had been in the habit of giving, would say a few words on his present position. He had nothing to repent of in his support of the late ministry, but the vote of non-confidence released all members from the ties they had assumed.²²⁷ When the last Government was formed it had included a large portion of the progressive party. A contract was entered into to carry out certain liberal measures, and had been fully carried out, to the satisfaction of a majority of the House. But the Government now stands in a very different position. At first it was composed of a majority of Liberals, now it is composed of a majority of Tories²²⁸, of men who proposed to stand still or go back.²²⁹ He must say that he regretted to see the two Attorney Generals in the Cabinet. They might have formed a strong Liberal administration; but if they take a different course he cannot follow them any further. The last Government had a distinct policy. They adopted the policy of the Hincks Administration; but the present Government has no avowed policy.²³⁰ They have come down and told the House what they will not do; not what they will do. Nor do they state distinctly what they are going to do²³¹, except as to the Grand Trunk Railway, on which they proposed to carry out the plan already published in the newspapers; but²³² they have not told the House what course of action they will pursue in case the Grand Trunk Company do not agree to the course proposed to them. They say, indeed, that they are going to carry out the principles of the former Government.²³³ He would like to know if they intend to carry out the ecclesiastical corporations bill as amended by the last Administration. If they do, he would like to know why it is that the late Attorney General was attacked in the *Journal de Quebec*, as a politician so dishonest that he would not do for any country in the world.²³⁴

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON desired to explain. The *Journal* is not his property. He had nothing to do with it; and he had written by telegraph to the Editor to stop those attacks on the late Attorney General.²³⁵

MR. PAPIN. — Then you must have something to do with it.²³⁶

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — The proprietor is my brother-in-law, and so far as I can exercise any influence I desire to do so.²³⁷

MR. RANKIN. — What about the bill.²³⁸

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — We will go on with the bill.²³⁹

MR. FELTON wished to know distinctly whether the bill is to be gone on with as the late Attorney General East amended it.²⁴⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the Government will go on with the bill as it was amended by the late Attorney General East, and will receive the support of the Commissioner of Crown Lands.²⁴¹

MR. FELTON was extremely glad to hear it, as it would remove unpleasant feelings in several quarters.²⁴² But still as regards all the other measures the House is left in the dark.²⁴³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — What questions?²⁴⁴

MR. FELTON. — The Government have not defined their policy. The House is left in the dark as to what they intended doing in all the public measures. He (Mr. Felton) would not ask them what

they intended doing on the Seat of Government question, as that question had already been asked, and no information would be given satisfactorily.²⁴⁵ Now, he remembers something about certain caucuses. He was present at two or three of them, and there was no mystery about the object, which was to induce a certain member of the House to retire from the Government. It was not desired to compel him to do so in an offensive manner; but to do so in the least possible offensive way.²⁴⁶ Much as he agreed with the gallant Knight from Hamilton, he (Mr. Felton) would say that there was a political necessity for such a movement.²⁴⁷ The object was not merely to induce that gentleman to retire, but to bring into the Government a gentleman of more liberal views.²⁴⁸ He would appeal to gentlemen present whether what he said was true or not. It was for this reason that the Attorney General West was sent for, because it was thought that he was a more liberal member than Sir Allan MacNab. Accordingly two liberal members were sent to wait on Mr. MacDonald, their object being to form a more liberal Government.²⁴⁹ He heard the names of several gentlemen mentioned, any one of which might have been the successor of the gallant knight in the event of his withdrawing. He heard the names of the Messrs. Smith, ... the member for Glengary,²⁵⁰ the present Receiver General, and Mr. Cauchon. There were no Conservatives named.²⁵¹ So far was the feeling carried that it was even proposed to adopt a distinct vote of want of confidence in the Administration as it was then constituted for the purpose of liberating the Government from its Conservative character.²⁵² He (Mr. Felton) would like to know from Mr. McDonald what political party Mr. Vankoughnet belonged to, that he should be called into the Ministry, or how he (Mr. Vankoughnet) corresponds to the wants of the caucuses, or the gentlemen who composed them. Notwithstanding the expressed wish of those gentlemen,²⁵³ when that vote of want of confidence came up accidentally the other day, instead of introducing into the Government a more Liberal member, they choose the most Conservative man that they could find not merely in the House, but anywhere. If the Liberals of Upper Canada are satisfied with the arrangement he can have no objection²⁵⁴. How he would ask, is the substitution of Mr. Vankoughnet for Sir Allan MacNab, calculated to increase the confidence of the House in the present Administration, or make the Government any better than it was before? As far as he (Mr. Felton) was concerned, he would support the Government, if Mr. Vankoughnet was sustained by an Upper Canadian majority²⁵⁵; but if they cannot agree to it, he will not be a party to force such a Government on them contrary to their wishes. He then went on to speak of the change that had been made by the Government²⁵⁶. Mr. Drummond was right in resigning in the Government; and he could not for a moment draw a contrast between him and his successor, who had not the same ability or experience as Mr. Drummond. On the contrary, he was inferior to him in every way. Does the hon. gentleman who succeeded Mr. Drummond bring a single vote with him, to add strength to his party? On the contrary, several gentlemen had left the Administration when that gentleman took the office he did. The Ministry ought to know that if they want liberal measures they must have liberal men in the Ministry. He was aware that some gentlemen who had local objects in view, would follow the Ministry for those objects. But he would tell them that they could not maintain their position; they could not follow their policy. If they pledged themselves ten thousand times they would not be believed.²⁵⁷ He told the members from Quebec that the Government could not carry out the vote for Quebec. They could not carry it out as a Government, and surely the members from Quebec were not going to sacrifice their principles on such a consideration as that. Then the new Attorney General was not capable of carrying out the Seigniorial tenure measure, not from want of ability, but because he had not turned his attention to it as Mr. Drummond had.²⁵⁸

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER was happy to inform the hon. gentleman that his friend the late Attorney General East had consented to go on with that measure to the end. If, however, he had not done so, he (Mr. C.) would have taken it up himself.²⁵⁹ [OR] He [Mr. Cartier] would have the assistance of the late Attorney General. (Laughter.) If not he would undertake the measure himself.²⁶⁰

MR. FELTON said that although the hon. member might have sufficient confidence in himself, he (Mr. Felton) had not confidence in his ability to carry on the measure. Then with regard to the

decentralization of the courts, how was that to be carried out? which of the Ministry had given attention to it, and who was prepared to go on with it?²⁶¹ If that measure had been carried out, the House would have had an entirely new system now.... Mr. Drummond devoted himself exclusively to the consideration of this measure; he had given up his practice at the Montreal bar — which was extensive — in order to consider this matter fully. On the other hand Mr. Cartier has not given up his business at the bar; but does a large business there yet. And he (Mr. F.) would like to know how he was going to carry out a measure of so much importance — taking all these things into consideration.²⁶² Then he [Mr. Felton] did not entrust the affairs of the country to a Government which would only have a majority of 4 or 5. How were they going to deal with the Municipal Loan Fund in Upper Canada? would not the temptation to gain a few votes relieving certain municipalities of their liabilities, be too great to be resisted under such circumstances.²⁶³ He was afraid that the government were not equal to meet all these measures. It is well understood that a political price is given for the political votes that sustain the Government, and he was unwilling to leave the power in the hands of members to do this thing, when there was such manifest temptation in their way. He had said this much to show his reasons for opposing the Ministry, and in conclusion he would support the motion now before the House.²⁶⁴

DR. POULIN would support the Ministry all the more warmly that an ex Attorney General had abandoned them. As a proof of the respective parliamentary influence of that hon. member and of his colleagues from Lower Canada, he cited the fact that Mr. Drummond had only passed his seigniorial and municipal bills by a majority drawn from Upper Canada with a minority from Lower Canada. The Legislative Council bill [sic] of the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Cauchon) was passed by a sweeping majority, and the school bills of the late Provincial Secretary, the present Attorney General, had been passed by large Lower Canada majorities. As for the new Lower Canadian minister, he had carried a bank bill against the opinions of the ministers and leaders of Opposition, through his personal influence.²⁶⁵

MR. TURCOTTE denounced the hon. member who had just spoken (Mr. Poulin) for his attack upon Mr. Drummond, confessedly one of the foremost men of the Province. The Government might say "Lord save us from our friends," if their friends sought to win favour with them by this sort of depreciation. It was easy to carry measures like the Legislative Council Bill, which every one was in favour of. It required ability and parliamentary influence to carry measures like our Seigniorial and Municipal acts, against which popular prejudices were arrayed — prejudices which required to be combatted and overcome. That was the task which the ex-Attorney General had performed, and performed well. (Hear, hear.)²⁶⁶

MR. FOLEY said, that reference had been made by the Commissioner of Crown Lands to a speech said to have been made in 1849 by the member for Sherbrooke — a speech, he believed, that never was made. But he had now before him another, a *bona fide* speech, made also in 1849, and reported in all the newspapers of Upper Canada, by the new Conservative colleague of the Postmaster-General. From the remarks of the Attorney General, one might have inferred that Mr. Vankoughnet, although a Conservative, was one of a very mild character, and that so far as political iniquity was concerned, he might be regarded as being as innocent as a sucking dove. But the fact was that all that gentleman's public acts and public declarations had shewn that, of all the Conservatives in this country, he had been one of the most ultra and one of the most outrageous in the assertion of his principles, and more particularly, although there remained little on record in regard to the public conduct of that hon. gentleman, that little showed that not only was he imbued with high Tory principles, but that he was imbued with the most intolerable hatred of everything French Canadian and Lower Canadian. Yet this was the gentleman who had been called into the defunct Conservative Coalition Cabinet for the purpose of conciliating the feelings of those French Canadians, and co-operating with them. But before reading the extracts which he meant to lay before the House, he would refer to the attempt made by the Commissioner of Crown Lands to

justify the introduction of Mr. Vankoughnet into the Cabinet, by making a parallel of the introduction of the member for Norfolk into the Hincks-Rolph Cabinet. The cases were entirely without parallel. Mr. Vankoughnet had never obtained a seat in this House or the other House, and had never been known as a leading public man. So far as political position was concerned, his position was that of extreme insignificance. Dr. Rolph, on the other hand, had for twenty years occupied a prominent position in the politics of the country. He had sat in the Legislative Halls of Upper Canada before the Union, for 15 or 16 years, and had been called upon by the almost unanimous voice of the Reformers of Upper Canada to take that leading position in public affairs which he had formerly occupied with so much credit to himself and usefulness to the country; and before the call was made on him to join the Government, he had the offer of at least half a dozen constituencies in Upper Canada. Was there any parallel between that case and that of taking into the Government a gentleman who never held any political position in the country?²⁶⁷

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — What of Mr. Young?²⁶⁸

MR. FOLEY said that Mr. Young had long been known as a leading public man, as having been connected with leading public works and with some of the great commercial transactions of the country, long before he was called on to take a part in the Government, and at the same time one of the largest constituencies in the country had nominated him and requested him to act as its representative. But Mr. Vankoughnet had not even a constituency to go to, and he would be surprised to find, and the country would be surprised to find any hon. gentleman in this House so unworthy of his seat as to resign it for the purpose of bringing about a personal or selfish accommodation for the Ministers of the day. Mr. Foley then proceeded to read extracts from a speech by Mr. Vankoughnet in 1849, at the League Convention, beginning — “Unless you can drive the French Canadians into the ocean, butcher and exterminate them, he asked in Heaven’s name what was to be done with them. He would have the French Canadians taught, and with a little severity if necessary — (hear, hear,) — that enjoying the protection of the British Crown, enjoying the support and association of the British people, they must share their feelings and assist them in their projects of improvement.” (Hear, hear.)²⁶⁹

MR. LORANGER. — Who said that?²⁷⁰

MR. FOLEY. — The Hon. Mr. Vankoughnet; and I suppose it was to tame these wild savages of the East that he was called in to assist the Liberal Postmaster General, and of course the Liberal Attorney General West.²⁷¹

MR. CONGER. — I would like to know what were your own opinions at that time.²⁷²

MR. FOLEY. — My opinions at that time were diametrically opposed to those I am reading, and moreover, unlike those of the member for Peterboro’, mine have never changed, and I trust I shall never have any temptation so great offered me as to be obliged like the member for Peterboro’, to change them.²⁷³

MR. ROBINSON. — Surely you have been reading a speech of the member for Lambton.²⁷⁴

MR. BROWN. — I really think that that is not a fair remark by the member for Simcoe. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware that the whole extent I have ever gone, and which I go now, is to maintain that all parties in this country shall stand on a level, and I have complained that we do not stand on a level with Lower Canadians, while Representation by population is denied us. But to say that French Canadians should be butchered and driven into the sea, who ever heard me give utterance to such a sentiment as that?²⁷⁵

MR. FOLEY having read several other passages of the speech of the same character,²⁷⁶

MR. STEVENSON crossed the floor, and asked for a sight of the newspaper, expressing some doubts as to the accuracy of the quotations.²⁷⁷

MR. FOLEY refused to show it to him.²⁷⁸

MR. STEVENSON said, that having been present himself, and not having heard such remarks he wished to see the paper.²⁷⁹

MR. FOLEY. — That is just on a par with the little trick played by the hon. gentleman the other day with the Picton petition. It is not I who am in the habit of playing those dastardly games of which hon. gentlemen are sometimes guilty. The paper from which I have read has been seen by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and they can tell whether I have misquoted a single sentence. And had the hon. gentleman asked for it in a courteous manner, I would have given it to him. It may be convenient now for hon. gentlemen to court the aid of the Lower Canadians, whom in their day of trial and adversity they sought to put still lower down, and that being the case it is proper the memory of the House should be refreshed in regard to the sentiments which were uttered in those days. Mr. Foley then alluded to the position of the Postmaster General, as now a member of a Conservative Cabinet, and predicted that his Reform constituents in North Wentworth would repudiate his course with indignation. He was glad that the hon. gentleman had at last fully shewn himself in his true colours. When he went back to Wentworth he would no longer hoist the old Reform banner, but he would hoist the black flag under which the gentleman to whom he had been alluding had rallied in 1849. But he was not so much surprised after all, that the Postmaster General should have returned to his first love, for if report spoke truly the doctrines at first advocated by the hon. gentleman on coming to this country were the doctrines which he had now again embraced. When Sir Francis Bond Head was Lieutenant Governor of this Province, he had it from gentlemen of the highest respectability that Mr. Spence was at that time as closely allied to the Tories of Upper Canada, as he seemed disposed to ally himself with them now, and he was found signing a congratulatory address to Sir Francis Bond Head, on his successful administration of the Government.²⁸⁰

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Does the hon. gentleman state that of his own knowledge, and if not, will he state his authority?²⁸¹

MR. FOLEY. — I will give you my authority in private if you desire it.²⁸²

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Oh! oh!²⁸³

MR. FOLEY. — I will do more for the Postmaster General. I will obtain for him the address with his name appended to it. (Hear, hear.) Will the hon. gentleman state that he did not sign it?²⁸⁴

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — I want your authority.²⁸⁵

MR. FOLEY. — He will hardly deny that he signed it for unlike the Halton platform, to which he merely verbally assented, this had the gentleman's mark. (Laughter.) Mr. Foley went on to express the hope that no Reformers in the House would longer permit themselves to be dragged through the mire by the Postmaster General. He replied also to the taunts thrown out by the Inspector General about differences of opinion among the Opposition, and maintained that they were not so great as those among the Ministerialists, as on every important measure they had brought forward they had been opposed by one section or another of their supporters.²⁸⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD having obtained the newspaper from Mr. Foley, re-read Mr. Vanhoughnet's [sic] speech, with the view of shewing that it [sic] fairly construed, it did not imply any levelling feelings towards the French Canadians. It was a speech made during the troublous times

when men thought and felt strongly — it was not a fair test of a man's opinions. A kinder hearted, more generous and liberal man did not live than Mr. Vankoughnet.²⁸⁷

CAPT. RHODES moved that the House do now adjourn.²⁸⁸

(547)

Then, on motion of Mr. *Rhodes*, seconded by Mr. *Bowes*,
The House adjourned.²⁸⁹

Footnotes

1. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
2. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
7. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
8. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
9. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
11. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
12. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
13. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
14. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
15. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
16. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
17. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
18. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
19. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856. *Globe*, 28 May 1856, differs from this newspaper and reports the following statement: "It was time the house should know whether advice was to be tendered to his Excellency by a united Cabinet or by a section of a Cabinet, who had considered it necessary to resign on an adverse vote of the house. (Hear, hear.)"
20. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
22. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
23. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
24. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
25. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
26. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
27. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
28. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
29. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
30. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
31. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
32. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
33. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
34. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
35. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
36. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
37. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
38. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.

39. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
40. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
41. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
42. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
43. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856.
44. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
45. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
46. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
47. *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
50. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
51. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
52. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
53. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
54. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
55. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
56. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
57. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
58. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
59. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
60. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
61. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
62. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
63. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
64. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
65. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
66. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
67. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
68. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
69. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
70. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
71. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
72. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
73. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
74. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
75. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
76. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Ibid.*
79. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Globe*, 28 May 1856. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856, specifies that the cries of "yes" and "no" came from members of the Opposition.
82. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
83. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
85. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
86. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856. According to *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856, Mr. Cayley stated that "great efforts to arrest this defeat were also made by the hon. gentlemen from Kingston and Halton." In the context of this speech, it seems more probable that he referred to Messrs. J.A. Macdonald (Kingston) and Spence (Wentworth North).
87. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
88. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
89. *Globe*, 28 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856, reports a statement which differs in many ways from the one reported in the *Globe*. It is as follows: "His hon. friend on his left (Mr. Macdonald) was very much shaken in his views in consequence of this resignation. He, however, retained his seat, lest it might be thought he resigned because he had

no confidence in, or no wish to serve under his late leader. But on the last occasion, the force of the vote induced all the Upper Canadian members of the Government to place their resignations in His Excellency's hands."

90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
91. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
92. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
93. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
95. *Pilot*, 31 May 1856.
96. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
97. *Pilot*, 31 May 1856. *Globe*, 5 June 1856, reports a commentary regarding Mr. Cayley's statements about the Grand Trunk scheme.
98. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
99. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
100. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
101. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
102. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
103. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
104. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
105. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
106. *Ibid.*
107. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
108. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
109. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
110. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
111. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856. This newspaper also reports that "the hon. gentleman's feelings quite overcame him" at this point in his speech.
112. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
113. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
114. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
115. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
116. *Ibid.*
117. *Ibid.*
118. *Ibid.*
119. *Ibid.*
120. *Ibid.*
121. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
122. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
123. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
124. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
125. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
126. *Globe*, 28 May 1856. The corresponding statement in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856, differs in many ways from the *Globe's*, as follows: "The result of these considerations expressed [sic] to his colleagues was that Sir Allan wrote the note in question to His Excellency, asking him to come [sic] down to his (Sir Allan's) residence, stating at the same time that these gentlemen had intimated their intention of resigning. The Governor General came to the Council, and asked him (Mr. Macdonald) and the other ministers present, did they intend to resign. He (Mr. Macdonald) was astonished at that question, as he had not stated his intentions to any one, and he took it for granted that either the Postmaster General or Mr. J.C. Morrison had spoken to his Excellency on the subject, as he (Hr. [sic] Macdonald) had not stated his intention to Sir Allan or His Excellency." According to *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856, Mr. J.A. Macdonald said that "he had not previously communicated his intention to resign either to Sir Allan or the Governor General. The note was written in Council by Sir Allan after they had stated their intention to resign, announcing to the Governor that they would persist in their resignation."
127. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
128. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856. It is impossible to ascertain whether this excerpt replicates the words used by Mr. J.A. Macdonald or whether it reports actual interruptions by "several gentlemen on the other side".
129. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
130. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.

131. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
132. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
133. *Globe*, 28 May 1856.
134. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
135. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
136. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856.
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
139. *Ibid.*
140. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
141. *Globe*, 29 May 1856. The ellipsis represents an illegible word.
142. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
143. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
144. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
145. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
146. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
147. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
148. *Ibid.*
149. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
150. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
151. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
152. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
153. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
155. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
156. *Ibid.*
157. *Ibid.*
158. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
159. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
160. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
161. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
162. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
163. *Ibid.*
164. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
165. *Ibid.*
166. *Ibid.*
167. *Ibid.*
168. *Ibid.*
169. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
170. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
171. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
172. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
173. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
174. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
175. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
176. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
177. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
178. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
179. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
180. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
181. *Ibid.*
182. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
183. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
184. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
185. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
186. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.

187. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
188. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
189. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
190. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
191. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
192. *Ibid.*
193. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
194. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
195. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
196. *Ibid.*
197. *Ibid.*
198. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
199. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
200. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
201. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
202. *Ibid.*
203. *Ibid.*
204. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
205. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
206. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
207. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
208. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
209. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
210. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
211. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
212. *Ibid.*
213. *Ibid.*
214. *Ibid.*
215. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
216. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
217. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
218. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
219. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
220. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
221. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
222. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
223. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
224. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
225. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
226. *Ibid.*
227. *Ibid.*
228. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
229. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
230. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
231. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
232. *Montreal Gazette*, 29 May 1856.
233. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
234. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
235. *Ibid.*
236. *Ibid.*
237. *Ibid.*
238. *Ibid.*
239. *Ibid.*
240. *Ibid.*
241. *Ibid.*
242. *Ibid.*

243. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
244. *Ibid.*
245. *Ibid.*
246. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
247. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
248. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
249. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
250. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
251. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
252. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
253. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
254. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
255. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
256. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
257. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
258. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
259. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
260. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
261. *Ibid.*
262. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856. The corresponding statement in *Globe*, 29 May 1856, is reported in the following manner: "The late Attorney General had given up his whole private practice to attend to the political affairs of the country, and for years had not had a single private case, while Mr. Cartier had a very large private business to attend to."
263. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
264. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
265. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
266. *Ibid.*
267. *Ibid.*
268. *Ibid.*
269. *Ibid.*
270. *Ibid.*
271. *Ibid.*
272. *Ibid.*
273. *Ibid.*
274. *Ibid.*
275. *Ibid.*
276. *Ibid.*
277. *Ibid.*
278. *Ibid.*
279. *Ibid.*
280. *Ibid.*
281. *Ibid.*
282. *Ibid.*
283. *Ibid.*
284. *Ibid.*
285. *Ibid.*
286. *Ibid.*
287. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
288. *Globe*, 29 May 1856. Commentaries on the debate of this day are reported in *Globe*, 28 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 28 May 1856, and *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856.
289. *Globe*, 29 May 1856, reports that "the House adjourned at midnight."

WEDNESDAY, 28 MAY 1856

(547)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By the Honorable Mr. *Merritt*, — The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of *Lincoln*.

By Mr. *Casault*, — The Petition of the Honorable *M.P. de Sales Laterrière* and others, of the Parish of *Les Eboulements*.

By Mr. *Brown*, — The Petition of *David Williams* and others, of the Township of *Arthur*.

By Mr. *Aikins*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of the Gore of *Toronto*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day the following Petitions were read: —

Of *William Campbell* and others, of the Parish of *Lacorne*; of the Reverend *M. Brunet* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jérôme*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Jérôme*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Adèle*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Sauveur*; of the Reverend *J.B. Lemonde* and others, of the Parish of *St. Sauveur*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Janvier*; of the Reverend *L.R. Fournier* and others, of the Parish of *Ste. Adèle*; of the Municipal Council of the County of *Terrebonne*; and of the Municipality of the Parish of *Lacorne*; praying that the Parishes of *Terrebonne* and *Ste. Thérèse* may not be annexed to the County of *Laval*.

Of *Joseph Longpré* and others, of the County of *Two Mountains*; of *Joseph Giroux* and others, of *Ste. Agathe*; of *Patrick Wheelan* and others, of the Counties of *Argenteuil* and *Two Mountains*; of *Thomas Conroy* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jérôme*; of *A.R. Miller* and others, of the Parish of *St. Columban*; of the Municipality of the Township of *Morin West*; of the Municipal Council of the western part of *St. Jérôme*; of the Municipal Council of *Mille-Isles*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Lacorne*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Jérôme*; of the Municipality of the Village of *Ste. Thérèse de Blainville*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Thérèse de Blainville*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Sauveur*; of the Municipality of the eastern part of the Township of *Abercrombie*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Adèle*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Anne des Plaines*; of the Municipality of the Parish of *St. Janvier*; and of the Municipal Council of the County of *Terrebonne*; praying that *St. Jérôme* may be made the chief place of the District of *Terrebonne*, as proposed in the Bill to prepare for the decentralization of the Judicial system of *Lower Canada* by subdividing it into smaller Districts, and providing for the building of Court Houses and Gaols therein.

Of *Magloire Dussaut* and others, of the Parish of *St. Jean Baptiste de Rouville*; and of *Nicolas Brouillet* and others, of the Parish of *St. Mathias*; praying for the abolition of Tithes.

(548)

Of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Magdeleine de Rigaud*; praying that the Counties of *Vaudreuil* and *Soulanges* may not be annexed to the District of *Montreal*, as proposed in the Bill to prepare for the decentralization of the Judicial system of *Lower Canada* by subdiv[id]ing it into smaller Districts and providing for the building of Court Houses and Gaols therein, but that they be formed into a separate District.

Of *John Burke*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. Columban*; praying that the Village of *Ste. Scholastique* may be made the chief place of the Judicial District of *Terrebonne*.

Of *Robert Simpson*, Mayor, and others, of the County of *Argenteuil*; praying that a District Court may be established in *Ste. Scholastique*.

Of *François Lepine* and others, of *La Cote de Beaupré*; praying that the *Quebec* Turnpike Trust may not be allowed to construct a Suspension Bridge at the same place, near the Falls of *Montmorency*, where the former one, which lately broke down, was erected.

Ordered, That the Petition of *O. Robitaille*, Esquire, Mayor, and others, of the City of *Quebec*, be referred to the Select Committee to which was [sic] referred the Entries in the Journals of this

House of last Session relative to the Petition of *John Maguire*, of the City of *Quebec*, Superintendent of Police; of *Samuel Snell*; of *Jean Dion*; and of *William Wright*, and others.

The House proceeded to take into consideration the Amendment made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the *Victoria Mining Company*;" and the same was read, as followeth: —

Page 7, line 11. Leave out from "Stock" to "This" in line ult.

The said Amendment, being read a second time, was agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. *Bowes* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath agreed to their Amendment.

Mr. *Brown*, from the Joint Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly for the direction of the Library of Parliament, presented to the House the Sixth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

The attention of the Committee has been directed to the necessity of making adequate provision, without delay, for securing the several Apartments wherein the Library is now deposited, from risk of accident by Fire. At present the Library is exposed to imminent danger, in the event of a Fire occurring in any part of the Parliament Buildings; and in such a contingency there is no way of egress from the principal Library Apartments, situated on the upper stories of the East and West wings, but by a circuitous route through the main Building.

The Committee are therefore of opinion that, until secure and adequate accommodation shall have been provided by the Government for the large and valuable Library which has been recently purchased, authority should be given to the Clerks of each House, to advance, out of the moneys in their hands for Contingent Expenses, the sum of Five hundred pounds, (in equal proportion, on behalf of either House,) to be expended, under the authority of the Speakers, in constructing Iron doors, at the different points of connection between the Library wings and the main Building, Iron shutters on certain windows more especially exposed to the risk of fire from the main Building, and outer staircases, communicating with the court yard, from the rooms now occupied as Libraries, on the upper floors.

These precautions, in connection with an adequate Insurance of the Books, which has been already effected, will, it is hoped, suffice to prevent the recurrence of disaster, or to mitigate the extent of loss, should an accident unfortunately occur. At the same time, the Committee would beg to call the attention of the Government to the dangerous state of the Roofing of the Buildings generally, which is composed of inflammable materials, liable at any moment to ignite by sparks from the chimneys.

Resolved, That this House doth concur with the Committee in the said Report.

Resolved, That this House doth concur in the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Contingencies.

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, pursuant to Addresses to His Excellency the Governor General, — Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 5th instant, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before the House, a Return of the Explorations and Surveys made within the last year in the Territory lying to the north of the Counties of *Peterborough* and *Victoria*, with the Reports made by the Surveyors employed on that service, shewing the Roads proposed to be opened, with the extent of lands embraced in such Survey or Exploration, and the quality of the same, and the quantity thereof fit for Agricultural purposes.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 57.)

Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly, of the 5th instant, for copies of Complaints preferred against *C. Cimon*, as School Inspector.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 16.)

Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 1st ultimo, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before the House, a Return

showing the amounts of land originally held by the *Toronto* General Hospital for the benefit of that charity, the quantity of lands disposed of, the value of the same, the dates of sale, and to whom sold; the income and expenditure of that institution from the time of the Union, the sources of revenue, including the annual amount of pay patients, and the amount actually received from the same; the number of patients admitted annually, the classification or nature of their disease, the number of convalescent patients discharged, the number discharged as incurable, as also the number of deaths, the nationality of patients so far as can be ascertained; and also, a copy of all correspondence that has passed between the late or present Government and the Hospital Trustees in reference to the removal of the Hospital to its present unhealthy location; and also, any correspondence that may have passed between the same in relation to the disposal of any of these lands.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 4.)

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

The House resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, on Monday last, proposed to be made to the Question, That the Orders of the day be now read; and which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing the regret of this House that the recent changes in the Administration are not such as to secure to the Constitutional Advisers of His Excellency the confidence of this House and of the Country" inserted instead thereof.

CAPT. RHODES had taken a very decided view on the subject before the house, and would explain the reasons why he could not support the new Government. During the existence of the Coalition Government, many members of the house, of whom he was one, had not given it a strenuous support. He had opposed them most decidedly on some points, while he had given them an equally decided support¹ when they were carrying out those great measures for which the country was desirous.² The support he had given it had not been given on any account of any sectional peculiarities in its formation, and he must say that he was surprised when they resigned in consequence of there being a mere sectional majority against them, when the house had given them a good working majority. He was opposed altogether to the system of a double majority. He could not understand whether the present Government was a new Government, or whether it was the old Coalition Government. — The word Coalition he believed had been abjured, but if it was still to be considered in the light of a Coalition, he must say that he regarded it as occupying a very different position from what it had done before, and as very much changed for the worse. The old Government was presided over by the member for Hamilton, who had always taken a very high stand in this country; but he had been removed and had been replaced by Colonel Tache, a gentleman who had occupied a position very different from that taken by the member for Hamilton.³ He thought [the Government] was weakened, not strengthened, by the loss of the Premier: — certainly his confidence in it had been weakened⁴, [and] he would feel compelled to oppose the present Administration. He had much more confidence in the talent, integrity and straightforwardness of the honorable gentlemen composing the former Administration, than those of the present. As a member of Liberal politics he felt compelled to take the first opportunity of opposing the present Administration, of whose principles or policy he for one, could not now approve.⁵ The resignation of the late Attorney General East, had in point of fact, removed the watch dog necessary to guard against the peculiar tendencies of the Commissioner of Crown Lands. The change made had not been towards those liberal views which are gradually spreading through this community, and had not been made with a view towards a satisfactory conclusion of our financial embarrassments.⁶ He had hoped that in any new arrangement the Ministry would have seen that their chief weakness arose from the loose and uncertain manner in which their financial affairs had been managed, and that they should have replaced the present Inspector General

by some man better fitted to cope with the great questions of finance with which the Government of this country were now called upon to deal.' [OR] The Government ought to have considered the solitary position occupied by the Inspector General, and they ought to have made such arrangements as to enable him to free the country from its present financial difficulties, and carry out successfully that great enterprise which attracts so much of the public attention. But instead of doing so, they sent for a gentleman residing in this city, a member of the legal profession. The consequence is that most of the members of the present administration are legal gentlemen, who, whatever may be their legal ability as pleaders, are seldom remarkable for strict financial abilities. The view which he now took of the formation of this Government is the same as they had taken of it themselves — that it is a political Government, without any other distinguishing feature. The gentleman who had been introduced into the Conservative element of Upper Canada appeared to him to be one who is a very good fellow, and a good companion, no doubt, as the Attorney General West would call him. (Laughter.) But as a Government was being formed for the purpose of treating (laughter) upon great questions, there should be a man of ability for the position chosen⁸ [and] he knew nothing of Mr. Vankoughnet which entitled him to his confidence.⁹ But he was disposed to think that Mr. Vankoughnet had been called in in order to continue those lengthy discussions which had characterized the present session, and to enable him to reply with effect to the able statements made by the Opposition. The gentleman's only ability was that of being an able debater, but he could assist the Attorney General West in making some of his long-winded speeches. (Hear, hear.)¹⁰ The latter hon. gentleman when he was called ... upon to form the Upper Canadian section of the Administration, was more actuated by a desire for personal aggrandizement in introducing Mr. Vankoughnet into the Councils of the House, than by any great national views. (Hear, hear.) It was now to be seen that of the Liberal party of Lower Canada, Messrs. Chauveau and Morin had been shelved, and Mr. Drummond had been obliged to leave, and Mr. Chabot if he was not now shelved, no doubt soon would be. (Hear, hear.) The Liberal party in Lower Canada had been gradually losing ground within the past few years¹¹, from a cause which was, at all events, well known to the honorable Commissioner for Public Works.¹² The Lower Canada Liberals were now only represented by the Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands. That hon. gentleman¹³ since he had been in his department had shown great fitness for the duties of it, and he (Mr. Rhodes) would have had no objection to follow or support him, if he were quite sure that he was disconnected from all those ultra influences which, though he had repudiated them, were held by others. It was clear that an illiberal system of government would not do for this country.¹⁴ [The Commissioner of Crown Lands] professed liberality now; but he could not get rid of his nature, and he was surrounded by men of illiberal views¹⁵. The honorable gentleman then proceeded to comment on the liberal conduct of these honorable gentlemen — the Irish Roman Catholics in that House, following the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands. Among those ultra-religious honorable gentlemen, were the honorable members for¹⁶ Bellechasse,¹⁷ Lotbiniere, Quebec, and Kamouraska. These honorable gentlemen were the principal gainers by that shuffle of the cards, which had placed the present Administration in power. He could not, therefore, support such a change¹⁸, and he had determined to join issue with them now, as he did at the last election, and as he would be prepared to do at the next election.¹⁹ The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Terrill) was introduced into the Cabinet as much from his being an English Protestant as any thing else, — (hear, hear,) — but they ought not to take religion or nationality into consideration in appointments to office. He (Mr. Rhodes) had always eschewed such distinctions, but he was not prepared to allow an illiberal party to ride over a liberal one. It was well known that such men as Mr. Terrill in the Eastern townships were left for a long time without the benefit of public roads and other improvements, so long as the ultra portion of the Canadian politicians had the reins of office; but it would be found, before long, that the parties who make these illiberal alliances, and who wish to put forth their illiberal views by appealing to the passions of the people, would no longer receive support. He, therefore, considered that if the statement were true, that the hon. member for Stanstead was chosen for the purpose of giving the Eastern townships a representative, it would apply equally to the Ottawa; and he thought that it would have been better to have followed up so good an arrangement by giving to

the Ottawa District a representative [sic] in the same manner.²⁰ Why was such a man as the member for Russell passed over — a man of long experience — and a new man out of Parliament taken into the Government over his head.²¹ All sorts of promises had been held out to him [Capt. Rhodes], as well as to other honorable gentlemen, in order to induce him to vote for the present administration. But not only had they endeavored to win his support by promises, but they had also used threats, in order to deter him from moving in matters offensive to the illiberal politicians in that House. (Hear, hear.) Those hon. illiberals threatened to have him opposed on all points — threatened to make the whole country rise up in arms against him. (Hear, hear.) He was to be driven by them down to all kinds of places, which, out of respect to the House, he would not mention, (loud cries of — name, name.) Well, then, he was to be sent to the Devil! (Loud laughter.) And even on the very question now before the House, he had been threatened, that in the event of his offering any opposition to the Government, persons would be sent through every part of his county, in order to prevent his re-election. (Name, name.) One of those who had threatened him, being his hon. friend from Champlain, — (hear, hear, and laughter)²² — who had come up to him, and in his significant way, shaking his finger, exclaimed, “Capitaine! Capitaine!” &c. (Laughter.)²³ Such threat[s], however, so far from frightening him, only convinced him of the weakness of those parties in order to gain political objects.²⁴ He would be prepared at any time to appeal to the people of this country, upon the course that he had all along followed; and he was prepared at all times to sustain the liberal views which originally brought him into Parliament, and to give way to any gentleman, if occasion should require, who could perform his duties better than himself. The present Ministry could not but be viewed with suspicion by the Liberal party of Lower Canada. He was perfectly satisfied that the course he had adopted, as a member of the Liberal party, in taking a stand against the present Government, would be approved of by all the Liberals of his section of the country. In regard to the gallant Knight, he would support him in his position towards the Administration, whether he was right or wrong. There was no merit in supporting a man, if he was right; but there was a great deal of merit in supporting a man when he was in the wrong. But he considered the position taken by the gallant member was right, and he should support him in it. He should vote against the Administration; but if it should be sustained by the vote of the House, he would take up an independent position, and support such of their measures as commended themselves to him. At the same time, he would keep a strict eye on the progress of what he considered the objectionable elements in the present Administration.²⁵

MR. ALLEYN thought it necessary to trouble the house, on account of some of the remarks of the last speaker.²⁶ He had never heard until told by the hon. member that he had been offered to be elected for Quebec, and he thought it somewhat strange.²⁷ But had he known it, it would have been a reason more strongly inducing him (Mr. A.) to stand as a candidate.²⁸

CAPT. RHODES said if the hon. gentleman would allow him a word of explanation, it might save him a long speech.²⁹ He had been asked by Hon. Malcolm Cameron to stand along with Mr. Alleyn and Mr. Blanchet to oppose the election of Mr. Chabot³⁰, who could have been elected for another constituency.³¹

MR. ALLEYN said he would not have consented to stand with Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Blanchet against Mr. Chabot.³² He knew nothing of Mr. Malcolm Cameron's desire until he heard from a friend that the hon. Mr. Cameron was canvassing for him, and he immediately stated that if Mr. Cameron did so, it would operate against him (Mr. Alleyn) and he would much rather that he would desist. The hon. member for Megantic ha[d] been bred a soldier, and had of late years turned his sword into a ploughshare, but it would seem that he was returning to his former profession. The way in which he has attacked hon. gentlemen on this side of the House was sufficient evidence — but that honorable and agricultural gentleman would find that he was mistaken.³³ The hon. member attacked the member for Lotbiniere as most illiberal in his views, and as an exemplification of an Irish Roman Catholic. That amounted to saying

that an Irish Roman Catholic was everything that was illiberal. He could not use language strong enough in reprobation of such a sentiment. He regretted that that hon. gentleman had so far forgotten what was due to common decency.³⁴ He [Mr. Alleyn] was an Irish Roman Catholic himself and proud to be so. The hon. member had sought at one time to curry favor with the Irish Roman Catholics at Quebec. He need not attempt it now.³⁵ But he would take leave to inform the House that that hon. gentleman making such an outrageous attack was not a very great man after all. (Laughter.)³⁶ The hon. member for Megantic claimed to be a distinguished agriculturist. He [Mr. Alleyn] believed his agricultural operations were confined to cultivating 20 acres of land in the vicinity of Quebec, and³⁷ if he ... was not misinformed, the chief supply of stock possessed by that hon. gentleman consisted in a Yorkshire sow. (Loud laughter.) And yet that gallant, hon. and agricultural gentleman thought fit to re-assume, as it were, his old post of drill sergeant in that House. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Alleyn) then proceeded to expose the erratic political course pursued by the hon. members for Megantic and Wolfe. They were now ready to take part with the hon. member for Lambton, in opposing this Administration — a gentleman whose whole course had been to fan the flame of religious discord in the country.³⁸ The hon. member [Capt. Rhodes] belonged to the Church of England, and yet he joined Mr. Langton in attempting to cut down the amounts to be given to the Church of England clergy. Was that the action of a Liberal?³⁹ The hon. gentleman oftentimes changed his views and his votes — some indeed might call him a loose fish, but in the same waters where loose fish swam there were flat fish as well as there were eels which no one could hold and there were sharks with a most insatiable appetite, but he had said enough about the hon. member.⁴⁰ It was, he considered, most extraordinary that the hon. member for Wolf[e] should now oppose the present Administration, which was found to carry out the very measures of the preceding Government that had been so strenuously supported by that hon. gentleman.⁴¹ The member for Wolfe asked last night whether he [Mr. Alleyn] was satisfied with the answers he had got to his questions to the Government about the £50,000 vote to Quebec, and the Grand Trunk and North Shore Railroads. In reply, he would say that he was quite satisfied with the answers he had received⁴² and therefore was not prepared to offer opposition to the Government. He did not see sufficient cause in the recent changes, though he might regret them, to forfeit his confidence.⁴³ He considered that the Government was to be carried on, on progressive reform principles. (Laughter.)⁴⁴

MR. WILSON. — Shuffling principles.⁴⁵

MR. ALLEYN. — The member for London also had peculiar notions about the Irish family, and he was not surprised therefore at his interruptions. He had heard last night with great satisfaction the remarks of the member for Waterloo (Mr. Foley.) He was glad to see the sensitiveness of the Lower Canadian members with regard to remarks made seven or eight years ago by Mr. Vankoughnet, for it showed they would not soon forget remarks made more recently by the member for Lambton. That gentleman would have much to answer for to his conscience, for having aroused religious prejudices in the country, and he was glad to believe that that gentleman could never look for support to Lower Canadians, in forming a Government under any circumstances⁴⁶, he who had so often and so recently abused all that Lower Canada held dear. They were told that the differences which separated liberals in Lower Canada from liberals in Upper Canada were of small importance, that they would disappear [sic], and the two sections unite again. Was he to understand by that, that the outcries about representation by population, and Separate Schools were so much clap trap for Upper Canada constituencies to be abandoned when office offered. He would not pass over any answer to French Canadians. He represented a large number of them. Lower Canada was the land of his adoption, and French Canadian blood flowed in the veins of his children, but he really did not see anything in Mr. Vankoughnet's speech which could give reasonable grounds of offence. It is a piece of oratory fitted to the occasion and audience, but not conveying any insult. He was surprised at the course pursued by the late Attorney General for Canada East. It was an illogical course to offer to aid the government in carrying through their measure[s], yet

at the same time to declare he would give his vote to upset the ministry, and so destroy the chance of passing the measures. He had heard him ... congratulate Mr. Terrill on his appointment, and offered to assist him [Mr. Terrill] in his election. How did that agree with the course he had seen fit to adopt now. He regretted the retirement of that hon. gentleman but did not think he acted properly in retiring.⁴⁷ As reference had been made to Quebec, he would say that great harmony prevailed among the different classes of the population.⁴⁸ The Irish Roman Catholics in Quebec ... were as liberal, if not more so, than any other party. Did any one ever hear of their posting inflammatory placards all through the city, denouncing a religious procession? He would venture to say not. He must again repeat, in the strongest manner, his disapproval of such unwarrantable and unfounded statements.⁴⁹ In Champlain-street, the head quarters of the Irish Catholics, there was a Protestant Church, and during three or four years he had never heard of the Protestant clergyman being insulted in going to or from it. Could any member of this house say that he had been insulted while in Quebec? Had there been any insulting placards on the walls?⁵⁰

MR. PATRICK. — Did not a large mob come in front of the Parliament Buildings and call loudly for certain members.⁵¹

MR. ALLEYN. — I do not know. Perhaps they wanted them to come out and make speeches to them. (Oh, oh.)⁵²

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX also repudiated the insinuations and assertions of the hon. member for Megantic. He remarked that the member for Megantic had complained that the politics of the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands were not liberal enough for him; yet he highly applauded the hon. Mr. Cameron, and the hon. and gallant knight who were more conservative. The government had endeavoured to do justice to the faith, the origin, and the district to which he belonged, by taking in Mr. Terrill, an English Protestant from the Eastern townships, in the place of the late Attorney General. But all this did not satisfy that hon. gentleman, who desired to follow the fortunes of those liberals — the hon. and learned member for Toronto and the hon. and gallant member for Hamilton. The hon. member here related the circumstances of the resignation of the old Cabinet, and the formation of the new one. He said if the Attorney General had reserved his right to discuss the future policy of the Cabinet, the reserve was a tacit one, and he thought that hon. gentleman was bound to have communicated any such idea to him, and to have acted frankly with him. The first and the only objection he heard him raise, was that respecting the leadership of the House, and he was surprised to learn yesterday that he had determined within himself to stipulate certain conditions about the future policy of the Cabinet. He had never heard of it before, and he thought the hon. gentleman was mistaken in raising that objection at such a moment, after he understood the government was formed.⁵³

MR. DRUMMOND said he had made this a condition of his acceptance of office in the first place. And Col. Tache had expressly said so in his explanations⁵⁴ in the Upper House.⁵⁵

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX. — That was understood to be the leadership in Lower Canada business.⁵⁶

MR. DRUMMOND. — There could be only one leader in the House.⁵⁷

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX. — It would not have been fair to Upper Canada that Lower Canada should have had the premiership and the leadership in both Houses. He regretted very much the retirement of the hon. member, and still more that he had seen fit to urge in that house reasons for it, which at the time he had not communicated to his colleagues. He felt that the hon. gentleman had, too, dealt unjustly by them when he came down to the House and stated he had no confidence in his

late colleagues' ability to carry on the government, and therefore could not give them his assistance as they had understood him to promise.⁵⁸

MR. DRUMMOND had said distinctly that he would support and aid them to carry through the measures of the old Government, and set a good example to those retiring from the Government, by supporting all the good measures they would bring forward. But he had told Colonel Tache so early as Monday morning, that if a vote of want of confidence came up, that he would not vote confidence in them. He had said to Mr. Terrill, that he congratulated him upon his appointment, for it had been his (Mr. Drummond's) anxious desire for a long time, to bring in an Eastern Township[s] man, and now this desire of his had been fulfilled without his intervention just as he was going out of office. He had promised to write him a letter to use with his (Mr. Terrill's) constituents. He had given him such a letter, and would read it. The hon. gentleman then read the following letter: —

"Toronto, 27th May, 1856.

"MY DEAR TERRILL, — I promised you that if you wished me to write to your county on your behalf, I would willingly do so; and now in answer to your note of this morning, I proceed to redeem my promise by addressing you these few lines. Having a high regard for you as a personal friend, and having also a high estimate of your natural talents, I should be sorry to see you thrown out of a seat in Parliament, where, I believe, you may hereafter render important services. But at the same time, I cannot approve of the new organization of which you form a part, especially so far as Lower Canada is concerned.

"L.T. DRUMMOND."⁵⁹

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX replied briefly to the statements made by the Hon. Mr. Drummond⁶⁰ —

Six o'clock arrived, and MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair.⁶¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER having taken the chair,⁶²

MR. DUFRESNE said, that the time consumed in discussing votes of non-confidence since the opening of the session, must have shown the absurdity of the present system. It was time to look this fact in the face, and to attempt to devise some new form of Government, of some description or another.⁶³ He was not prepared to say what that system should be.⁶⁴ The ex-Ministers had been blamed both in and out of the house for their resignation, and the Governor General was of the same opinion.⁶⁵ He agreed with the Governor that the Ministry should not have resigned upon the late vote, although he admitted the force of the argument, that when upon a direct vote of want of confidence, either section of the Government found itself in a minority in its own section, it should resign. The Upper Canada members of the Government having resigned, the Lower Canadian ministers had no choice but to follow their example.⁶⁶ It was said ... that that did not oblige the Lower Canadian members to resign, but by the absurdity of our system it seemed to him that this followed as a matter of course. Whatever confidence he might have in the present Government he would vote against the proposition before the house, and believed any such motion ought to be received with a movement of indignation.⁶⁷ He was desirous of going on with the business of the country. The Lower Canadian section of the Government had been sustained by a large majority on the previous vote, and he could see no good grounds for now withdrawing confidence.⁶⁸ It was indeed said that the circumstances were changed since the last vote, but really there had been no change of consequence in the men or the measures. As to the one side of the house or the other he had the same confidence in both of them.⁶⁹ There were men in the Government in whom he had no confidence, as there were men upon the opposition benches whom he could not support. There was so much selfishness among our public men, that it was impossible to feel full confidence in almost

any Government. He did not approve of the alliance between the Liberals and Conservatives, but he regarded it as a necessity of the hour, arising out of the absurd Governmental system that prevailed here. The opposition should have awaited fuller explanations from the Government, before proposing this vote of want of confidence. He judged men by their acts, and would therefore await the measures of the Government before judging of them. The Grand Trunk difficulty was certainly the great question now before the Province. The member for Megantic had felt aggrieved because the Government refused to sacrifice the interests of the country to those of the Company. He (Mr. Dufresne) believed that the Government had yielded too much to that Company. The country had been duped by it. If the Government came down with any scheme to give any further aid to the Grand Trunk, it would thereafter receive his opposition. As to the North Shore Road, it had been pronounced an act of corruption on the part of the Government.⁷⁰ He did not believe that the Administration had any intention to bribe members by it. It was no crime to regard the wants of the country, and the claims made by the representatives of the people.⁷¹ He approved of that scheme. It was a wise step to give a few millions of acres of worthless land for the opening up of the country, and making other lands tenfold more valuable. He would be glad if such a course had been taken with the Grand Trunk.

The hon. gentleman having said so much in French, continued in English as follows: — He said that it was well known that when the late Administration was formed by Sir Allan McNab, he (Mr. D.) was not one of the first to join it, and give it his support. Indeed he expressed to the House his opinion that he had great suspicions as to the actions of the party.⁷² He (Mr. D.) was very much afraid that the Tory element in it would overpower the Liberal element.⁷³ But when he saw that the Administration was willing to grant every liberal measure that the country required — such as the Clergy Reserve[s] and the Elective Council Bill — when he saw that disposition he could not withhold from them his support. In supporting the late administration he had no personal ambition to please.⁷⁴ Of late Sir Allan MacNab's friends had shewn a disposition to split off from the ministry, that being the case, he had apprised one of the ministry, that he was ready to support him if he got rid of Sir Allan MacNab, though he was satisfied with the liberality of the ministry as it had existed. He acted in that manner because it was the friends of Sir Allan who threw the first stone, at the same time he regretted the necessity for the gallant Knight leaving the administration⁷⁵. He would tell that hon. gentleman that he had the greatest respect for him. During the administration of the hon. and gallant knight from Hamilton great and important measures had been passed. Sir Allan might have been what is called a conservative, but he (Mr. D.) believed that he was as liberal as any man in that house; and he regretted that he was out of the Administration. Further than that he (Mr. D.) believed that if he (Sir Allan) had been able to have attended in his place in the house, he would have been at the head of the government to-day; and perhaps he (Mr. D.) would be supporting him. But, notwithstanding all this he (Mr. D.) was not now going to record a vote of non-confidence against the colleagues with whom he had acted for years.⁷⁶ As to the gentleman who had succeeded him, he did not know him, and not knowing him, how could he vote non-confidence in him?⁷⁷ He would ask the hon. and gallant knight from Hamilton to leave off at once all personal sentiments and support the Administration on this occasion. (Laughter.) Of course the hon. gentleman was at liberty to do as he pleased.⁷⁸ He was also exceedingly sorry that Hon. Mr. Drummond should have left the ship, on account of a disagreement between himself and one of his colleagues as to who should have the first seat in this House.⁷⁹ Mr. Drummond had stated that he left the government because he thought that they could not carry on the business of the country⁸⁰, [that they] had not sufficient ability and Parliamentary experience to entitle them to the confidence of the house. He thought it a strange position for the hon. gentleman to take in regard to colleagues with whom he had acted for two years.⁸¹

A Member. — That is the result of his two years' experience of them.⁸²

MR. DUFRESNE went on to express the hope that Mr. Drummond also would lay aside personal piques and support the present Administration. The hon. gentlemen [sic] had pointed out five or six

members as qualified to join the Government [sic]. And one of those having been appointed, the hon. gentleman turned round and opposed them. What was that but treason?⁸³ That gentleman also said, indeed, that he will support his own measures. Of course he will; a mother will not smother her own children. (Laughter.)⁸⁴ The hon. gentleman, being no longer in the Government, or capable of being taunted with supporting certain measures merely because he held a portfolio, could now show his patriotism by continuing to support the Government⁸⁵, and enabling the business of the House and of the country to be carried out. If Mr. Drummond was to take this course he (Mr. D.) believed that the country would have greater confidence in him, than it ever before had. He would now turn his attention to Mr. Rhodes, who says himself that he is now a liberal; whereas he (Mr. D.) always thought that he was a tory.⁸⁶

CAPT. RHODES said that he always supported the Hincks Administration, and it was well known that that administration was not a Tory one.⁸⁷

MR. DUFRESNE thought this was satisfactory. Again he would call on the hon. gentlemen whom he had named to act the part of true patriots. (Laughter.) Hon. gentlemen might laugh as they pleased now, but they would not laugh when they went to their constituents. (Laughter.) He was not afraid to go to his constituents on those grounds with any of those gentlemen to-morrow. When he saw his fellow countrymen in the House going with such men as the hon. member for Haldimand and the hon. member for Lambton — men who fancied Lower Canadians as beggars, ignorant and lazy, he (Mr. D.) determined for one that those gentlemen should never have his support. He looked upon them indignantly. He did not care for them. Not only that, but the journals under the control of these gentlemen also repeated the same attacks upon Lower Canada. Taking all these things into consideration, no gentlemen of his origin could be so base as to support those gentlemen.⁸⁸

MR. RANKIN said he had on a former occasion declared it was in his power to give explanations of the intrigues which had led to the recent changes. But the explanations of Ministers themselves relieved him of that necessity. They stood self-convicted and self-condemned of treachery to their former leader, and particularly was this true of the present leader of the Government in this house. The Ministry had resigned, because they had lost the confidence of moderate Reformers. They again took office, without knowing whether they had regained the confidence of those Reformers. The Postmaster General, when asked whom he now represented, said he knew nothing at all about it. He entered this Government simply because the Attorney General asked him. Nor could he tell by what name the Government was to be known, when it was no longer a Coalition.⁸⁹ The liberal members of the Government should, before accepting office, have seen their friends and consulted with them upon the subject. They had not done so, however. They were in the Cabinet at the request of a prominent Conservative, without being the representative of any party. He believed the liberal element in the Cabinet was now completely swamped.⁹⁰ The leader of the Government called himself a Conservative, and the gentleman he introduced into it (Mr. Vankoughnet) had always been known as a thorough Conservative.⁹¹ He would ask when that was the fact how they could presume to ask the support of any man calling himself a Reformer? It would be much more manly in the Government to call itself by a proper name. It was essentially Conservative, and should not be ashamed of the name.⁹² Mr. Vankoughnet was an eminent lawyer, but what position was he placed into? Into the Bureau of Agriculture? The hon. gentleman had a great reputation for his power in addressing Juries. He would have been of great use to the Government to-night by exerting his powers to plead on behalf of the culprits now under trial. (Laughter.)⁹³ But good pleader as he was, he (Mr. Rankin,) was not aware that he was remarkable for a knowledge of agriculture.⁹⁴ Why had they gone out of the house to find a colleague? There were two alternatives. Either they were of opinion that there was no gentleman of the Bar in this house qualified to be placed at the head of a department; or else, of all the gentlemen so qualified, there was none so lost to all regard for his own interests, as to be willing to join his fortunes to theirs. (Hear, hear.)⁹⁵ They had selected a gentleman unexperienced in politics, and

who had not yet obtained the confidence of any constituency. It would have been more honorable in that gentleman to decline the position offered him. Had he so declined, he would have stood much higher, than by coming in as the fag end of such an administration as now occupied the treasury benches.⁹⁶ The Attorney General West, some time ago, said he had a leader in the gallant Knight — and so long as the gallant Knight would lead, he would follow. Yet when Col. Tache sent for him, how did he act? Did he take the course any honourable man in his position would have taken, and refer Col. Tache to the gallant Knight, as the leader under whom he acted. The Attorney General had introduced Mr. Vankoughnet — and why? Simply because the Government wanted a clever lawyer to plead for them in the house, and to shield them from the consequences which their criminal acts were likely to bring on them.⁹⁷ It was admitted that the gallant knight was as liberal as any other man in the Cabinet, but he was unpopular with the Reformers. There was no evidence that Mr. Vankoughnet would be more popular. He [Mr. Rankin] was not prepared to charge the Government with corruption. They were unworthy of confidence not because they were dishonest and corrupt, but because they were not competent. They lacked the moral courage and ability to originate a good party. They were ever ready to do anything with their measures to get support for them. The men who govern this country, should have ability and a thorough knowledge of the country they governed. They should come down boldly with their policy, and upon its merits demand the support of this House.⁹⁸ Why did not the Government come down and declare what their policy is, in regard to the several important measures upon which the country required to be informed? But no; their reply to enquiries always was — “The subject is under consideration.”⁹⁹ The conduct of the Government upon the Grand Trunk question, was evidence of their lack of ability and decision of character. If they had not the ability to originate a policy upon this question, they should make room for those who had.¹⁰⁰ The course that ought to have been taken by any Government deserving the confidence of this House, in regard to the Grand Trunk Road, would be, to devise means by which a western and eastern outlet could be obtained for it.¹⁰¹ This could be done. The people of New Brunswick could be invited to assist in a scheme whereby the road could be continued to Halifax. Such a terminus would secure for the road 90 out of every 100 passengers crossing the Atlantic. He approved of the North Shore scheme, and thought similar means might be adopted to carry the Grand Trunk Railway to Halifax. He dwelt upon the importance [sic] of securing an Eastern terminus to the Grand Trunk at Halifax, believing it would bring about a union of all the Provinces, which he much desired to see. These were the measures which a Government should take up;¹⁰² but the present gentlemen on the Treasury benches were not equal to such a task. The great characteristic of the Government was, a strong desire to please everybody; but that was not what the country wanted. Another objection that he had to them was, that they had not a thorough knowledge of even the very country which they governed. The land around Lake Superior, on the Canada side, was rendered almost valueless by the neglect of Canadian Governments — and of the present one, as of previous ones. It was almost unsettled, and even unexplored, while, on the other side of the lake, under the American system, every inducement was held out to explorers and to settlers.¹⁰³ The comparison of the American and Canadian side[s] of the Lake was such as to make us blush, — and this want of progress was owing entirely to the policy, or want of policy on the part of the Government. The Government had devised most ingenious means of preventing the country from being settled.¹⁰⁴ Did not the revenue of the Province suffer by locking up millions of acres of land in this way? There was only one plan to remedy such an evil, and that was to get into office a set of men who best knew what course to pursue for the country’s good. We wanted a more vigorous government. Yet if this administration had come down and laid before the house a bold and comprehensive policy, which they were prepared to pursue, upon the various matters of vital interest to the country, he should have felt himself as an independent member, perfectly at liberty to support them; but he had listened in vain for such an announcement upon their part, for he found out that their sole desire was to adopt some means by which they could be permitted a little longer to retain office. The hon. gentleman then alluded to some remarks which had fallen from him on a previous occasion, in regard to the Attorney General West.¹⁰⁵ He begged to say that it was a matter of regret to him that he had, on former occasions, indulged in personal attacks

on the Attorney General West; but he could assure the house that he never would have done so had he not been under a misapprehension as to the character of that gentleman. Since it was not his practice to assail any one of whose promptness to resent an offensive personal allusion he entertained the least doubt; but as he had discovered that he was mistaken in the man, he should for the future endeavour to abstain from saying anything to wound his feelings.¹⁰⁶ He much regretted that anything had occurred to cause any unpleasant feeling between him and that hon. gentleman.¹⁰⁷

MR. POULIOT condemned the motion of want of confidence, because it was only made to prevent the business of the country being proceeded with, and to infuse anarchy into the ministry.¹⁰⁸ [He] would support the Administration. He strongly objected to the double majority principle.¹⁰⁹

MR. LORANGER explained that in voting as he had, ... he should go against the new organization of the Ministry.¹¹⁰ [He] hoped that hon. gentleman [sic] with whom he had hitherto acted, would not imagine that in taking his present position, he was leaving¹¹¹ the party with which he had acted, and intended to act so long as parties existed — though he hoped for a speedy fusion of parties.¹¹² He did not desert the Ministry for the purpose of throwing himself into the arms of the Opposition. Having taken a prominent position during the previous part of the Session in support of that Administration, he conceived it would be improper for him to give a silent vote on the question before the House. He held that the Ministry having been defeated, it was unconstitutional for the same hon. gentleman [sic] to return to that House and claim its confidence. With reference to the double majority principle, he would say that he highly approved of it. It was, he considered, the safe-guard of the liberties of each section of the Province.¹¹³ The only safety for Lower Canada was in the maintenance of the double majority system. That system was ignored by the return to power of the Upper Canada section without increased Upper Canada support after a defeat from that section.¹¹⁴

MR. POULIOT explained that he was favorable [sic] to the double majority principle under certain circumstances; but as it was a question which affected equally both sections of the Province, it ought not to prevail.¹¹⁵

MR. LORANGER insisted that it was the only principle that could prevail in this country; and the Ministry having resigned on it, they would, if left now in a small minority by Upper Canada, be again compelled to resign. Such conduct on the part of the Government, was only trifling with the House. He could well understand the position of those hon. gentlemen, who disapproving of the principle on which the Government had been re-organized, nevertheless were unwilling to record a vote of want of confidence in it, because by doing so, they would put a stop to the business of the country. He admired the generosity that prompted such sentiments. They partook of true patriotism. But he should say that he regarded the principle on which the present Government had been re-organized, as of so dangerous a character that he could not — even by implication — be supposed to give it his assent. With reference to the late Attorney General East, who had been pleased to refer to him in terms of praise, he would say that there was no man in this country for whom he entertained greater feelings of respect. He would be sorry that hon. gentlemen should for a moment think that because he now found himself not at accord with him, that he was prepared to abandon him. He looked upon him as the champion of popular principles in this country. With reference to the present Premier, Col. Tache, being sent for to form an Administration in the country, he felt proud that that hon. gentleman had been so highly honored by the representative of the Sovereign. He complained of the arrangement by which the Government came into office, as one which affirmed a principle which he considered dangerous to the country; and he was not to be deterred from taking that position by the taunts of hon. gentlemen that he had gone into the arms of the hon. member for Lambton. His friends might depend on it, that so long as that hon. gentleman gave utterance to the sentiments he had been in the habit of uttering on the floor of that House, and through the press under his control, he (Mr. Loranger) would never be found sitting on the same benches with him. He

had laid it down as a principle, that no Administration should after a resignation, come down again to that House as a Government, precisely the same as when they had resigned. The two changes made in the Government, in this instance, in no way altered its character. Mr. Vankoughnet was of the same political creed as the hon. member for Hamilton whom he was to replace in the Cabinet. Hence there was no alteration of party in the Government. He was not acquainted with Mr. Vankoughnet, but had heard of him as a lawyer of great eminence. Whether that hon. gentleman had any political experience or not, however, he could not say. Last evening the hon. member for Waterloo, had read a speech which had been delivered by Mr. Vankoughnet some few years ago. Now he, (Mr. Loranger) would say that he also had read that speech, and he should in fairness say that he could not in fairness draw from it the interpretation attempted to be forced on it by the hon. member for Perth. Were it, however, even as illiberal, as had been represented, it was most unjust to take the sentiments of a gentleman, delivered at a time of great excitement, as his political views.¹¹⁶ It was true that he had advocated warmly the Anglification of Lower Canada by Upper Canada, or federation. Probab[l]y there were not two men in Upper Canada, who did not at that time entertain the like opinion and the like desire.¹¹⁷ An opportunity should be afforded that gentleman to express his opinions on the floor of that House, before any hon. gentleman attempted to fix on him any sentiment drawn from his utterance at a particular and exciting time. It had been said that he (Mr. Loranger) was influenced in the vote he intended to give, only by friendship for the late Attorney General East; but he would assure the House that he was influenced by no such motives. His friendship with the late Attorney General East, however strong it might be, did not in the least influence his (Mr. Loranger's) conduct; for he had told that honorable gentleman at the very outset, that whether he entered the Administration or not, he (Mr. Loranger) could not consent, even by implication, to approve of the principles affirmed in the reorganization of the Cabinet. He would say, that if after this motion was approved of, it were found that a majority of the House approved of the conduct of the Government, and wished it to carry on the business of the country, he, for one, would not be found offering any factious opposition to it;¹¹⁸ he should support those measures which were in accordance with his views and the policy of the Coalition ministry.¹¹⁹ He regretted the necessity which compelled him to separate for a moment from the friends with whom he had acted during the last of the present session; but from the first moment the reorganization became known, he had explained to them his position. In Lower Canada, he believed there was but one great party, and he sincerely hoped that those differences, immaterial in themselves, which for the moment separates [sic] French Canadians, would soon be forgotten; and show that Lower Canadians, united together as they should be, in defence of their common principles and common nationality, were influenced only by one motive, a love for the popular interest, and a desire to advance the good of the country.¹²⁰

MR. BOWES expressed his deep regret to hear from the honorable member for Essex, that the Government which he was supporting had been caballing against the gallant Premier. But the best proof they could have of caballing would be found in considering who had turned out the Government. The Attorney General was charged with caballing against the Premier. But by what means were the Government turned out. He would state that on the night that vote of confidence was taken, not one member who supported the Attorney General at the commencement of the present session, voted against him that night. But the honorable member for Essex was one of the parties who by his vote turned his friend's Government out. It is all very well for honorable gentlemen to express their sympathy. He regretted as much as any gentleman that the honorable and gallant knight had been ejected from the Government. But when he considered that this Government had been opposed with a violence never before seen in any legislature, he looked upon it as strange that these same gentlemen who had opposed the Government should cross the floor and shake hands with the gallant knight because he had been turned out; when their whole aim had been to turn him out. He sympathized with the honorable member for Hamilton as much as any man. He was glad to see him back in the House. But he did not like to see that sympathy expressed by those who gave the hon. gentleman the stab in the dark that turned him out. The late

Government had been charged with all sorts of departmental delinquencies; but he would only refer to the speech of the hon. member for Grey, the hon. gentleman who threw the first stone at the Government. That hon. gentleman said that in so far as the Postmaster General was concerned, his department had been managed in such a way as the post [sic] office had never been before. This was the kind of reform that was needed — not sitting here night after night, charging the Government with all sorts of delinquency. The fact is, there is too much intellect in the House for the good of the country. (Hear, hear.)¹²¹ What was wanted was plain business talent.¹²² A reference had been made to the hon. Commissioner of Crown lands, and he would say that the gentleman at the head of that department was the first to attempt to root out¹²³ the abuses which had made that department the matter of complaint¹²⁴, and thoroughly reform it. Was this Opposition to reform? As to the financial department, not a single charge had been proved against that department. Who was it [that] brought in the audit system? It was the gentleman at the head of that department — the hon. [Inspector General.]¹²⁵ These were true reforms. It did not matter with common men who acted thus — they were in reality reformers.¹²⁶ He would also allude to the railroad policy of the Government. It had been originally intended to construct the line of railway from Toronto to Montreal at a cost of £3,000 a mile. A large portion of the money for that object was appropriated to the construction of railroads in Lower Canada; and a large portion of the stock was placed at 50 per cent discount. A portion of the stock was in the hands of United States citizens, and it was just as legitimate to apply to the citizens of the United States as to the Government here. He would say that no Government occupying seats in this House dare come down and make the representations made by the representatives of the stockholders in Great Britain.¹²⁷ If ministers had done so, they would be unworthy of the confidence of the House or the country. He contended that if any one had deceived the English stockholders it was the English contractors. The agents of this province were not aware of the prospects of a railway. They were not experienced railway men; but one of those contractors came out here to see for himself, and made his own report; and it was on his opinion that the Government and Parliament of Canada, as well as English capitalists acted.¹²⁸ He would say that it behoves the Government to come down with a policy that would secure the people of this country; not the contractors and shareholders. But it was unfair to ask the Government, only three days old, to come down with a policy that it would take months to construct. He maintained that the railroad policy of the country was a progressive one.¹²⁹ He attributed the break up of the Government more to Grand Trunk pressure, than to caballing inside the Government. It was broken up because the friends of the Premier deserted him. Not one friend of the Attorney General West had deserted him, and he believed that none would desert him to-night.¹³⁰ With regard to Mr. Vankoughnet, he paid him a very high compliment for the manner in which he had worked his way onward, and when he made his appearance on the floor of that House, he was satisfied he would win a position there second to none.¹³¹ He was the same sort of Conservative as he (Mr. Bowes) was, willing to conserve what was good, and to reform what was wrong.¹³² Before sitting down he would allude to the very extraordinary speech made by the hon. member for Megantic. The speech appeared to him (Mr. B.) to be made up of baby-kissing, beer drinking, and an allusion to the tee-total doctrine. The hon. gentleman after some further remarks sat down.¹³³

MR. FERRES began by referring to the fact that this was the fourth or fifth time¹³⁴ this session in which the Administration had had to vindicate itself before the country by showing that it had a majority of the house. This was enough to show that the present debate was due to personal and party feelings.¹³⁵ The time of the House had been squandered, and for three weeks the Orders of the Day had never been reached. This was well for the opposition who were now the outs and who expected in a few days to be the ins. The interests of the country were not the ruling motive in the conduct of the opposition, it was rather the petty interests of party.¹³⁶ It might be very convenient for those who hoped to win office to play this game, but not so to those who came there sincerely desirous of doing the business of the country to have their time wasted and the business suspended, while they repeated time after time the History of the late Government from its first foundation. One of the objections most strongly urged against the

members of the late administration is, that they had passed the Superior Education Bill. For that they deserved the greatest credit. They were the first Government that had dared to deal with the Jesuits' estates — to sell them and fund the proceeds. It had been said that it was monstrous to give £22,000 for the superior education of 15,000 children, but that was not all to be given for the children; there was a Normal School for training teachers, to be supported out of it; but when they considered the large sums devoted to this sort of education in England, this was by no means a disproportionate amount.¹³⁷ The late Government had been defeated upon the Seat of Government question. He had all along voted against Quebec as the Seat of Government, and he would continue to do so. The Government had no choice in the matter, but to bring down the appropriation.¹³⁸ That was merely the carrying into effect of the orders of the house. Ministers could pursue no other course; they were not properly responsible for it.¹³⁹ And when voting against it, he did not consider that he was voting against the government.¹⁴⁰ They had heard a great deal about caballing against some members of the Government, particularly the hon. member for Hamilton. He [Mr. Ferres] had attended many meetings of the Conservatives but he had known of no such caballing.¹⁴¹ After the Duval case, many of the conservatives had voted against the Government, and a caucus was held afterwards from which a deputation was sent to the members of the Cabinet to assure them that their confidence was undiminished. At that time it was rumoured that Sir Allan McNab intended to retire.¹⁴² The deputation which waited on the Attorney General, expressly stated that they did not wish to suggest any change, but if any were to take place, that they should have confidence in any re-construction which he should lead. He did not know whether any conservative was intending to withdraw his support from the Attorney General, but he could not do it. He had given his word; had induced the Attorney General to go forward in making a new ministry. Though this ministry did not altogether suit him in its composition, yet he should not draw back from his pledge.¹⁴³ He was prepared to give his support to it. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁴ He could not but think that much of the sympathy expressed for Sir A. MacNab by those opposition members who had driven him from office was just to wheedle him into a course opposed to the views of the friends with whom he had always heretofore acted, in opposition to the present ministry.¹⁴⁵ (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁶ He was glad to see the English population of Lower Canada recognized in the person of an Eastern Townships man. If any man found his personal claims slighted, his personal ambition disappointed by that appointment, he thought it would be a wiser and a more patriotic course not to allow such a cause to drive him into a change of position. He regretted that the late Attorney General for Lower Canada had left the Government, and the opinion was the more disinterested, as he had reason, if any man had, to desire his downfall, for no man had so opposed another in an election as that honble. gentleman had opposed him. But an election was one thing, and the estimate of a man's public course another; and he could not forbear to recognize the ability with which that hon. gentleman had conducted the public affairs entrusted to him.¹⁴⁷ He regretted his absence the more because there were members in the present Administration whose opinions would not receive that check which it was necessary they should receive.¹⁴⁸ But he did not think that the hon. gentleman had grounds to oppose the new ministry. He quite approved of the appointment which had been made of the President of the Council.¹⁴⁹ He regretted the attempt that had been made to damage Mr. Vankoughnet by the reading of the speech delivered some seven years since. He (Mr. Ferres) was present at that meeting, and he remembered that the impression at that time was anything but that attempted to be made upon this House.¹⁵⁰ The tenor of that speech was not that of hostility to French Canadians, but an advocacy of means of defence of Upper Canadians against what was then felt to be French Canadian dominancy.¹⁵¹ It was said that the Government had no railway policy. He could not see how this was shewn. They had no opportunity of declaring their policy. He believed they had a railway policy, which would be satisfactory alike to the Grand Trunk directors and the country.¹⁵² He (Mr. F.) was quite prepared to do more than justice to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.¹⁵³ The Lake Huron Railway policy instead of being a charge against the Government, was a reason for supporting them.¹⁵⁴ As to giving the wild lands for railroad purposes, he was in favor of it, and taking them away from the Crown Lands Department. They would then be settled, which they could not now be by being locked up; not yielding one

shilling. There could be no reason why these lands should not be given for the purposes of the North Shore railroad.¹⁵⁵ The Coalition Government had fulfilled its mission, and would be remembered with gratitude by the country for having softened differences between the two races in Lower Canada, and led to a fusion of liberal conservatives and moderate reformers into a great party.¹⁵⁶

The house then adjourned, and the subject was ordered to be the first order of the day.¹⁵⁷

(550)

Then, on motion of the Honourable Sir *Allan N. MacNab*, seconded by the Honorable *Mr. Chabot*,
The House adjourned.¹⁵⁸

Footnotes

1. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
2. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
3. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
4. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
6. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
7. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
8. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
9. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
10. *Globe*, 29 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856, differs slightly from this newspaper, reporting that Capt. Rhodes referred to Mr. Vankoughnet's "ability to help the late Provincial Secretary to make some of those three or four hour speeches, with which the business of the session had been already protracted."
11. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
12. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
13. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
14. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
15. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
16. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
17. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
18. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
19. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
20. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
21. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
22. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
23. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
24. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
25. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
28. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
30. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
31. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
32. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
33. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
34. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
35. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.

36. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
37. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
38. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
39. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
40. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
42. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
43. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
44. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
48. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
49. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
50. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
51. *Ibid.*
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
54. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
55. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Ibid.*
58. *Ibid.*
59. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
60. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
63. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
64. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
65. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
66. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
67. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
69. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
70. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
71. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
72. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
73. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
74. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
75. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
76. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
77. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
78. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
79. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
80. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
81. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
82. *Ibid.*
83. *Ibid.*
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
85. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
86. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
87. *Ibid.*
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
91. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.

92. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
93. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
95. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
96. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
97. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
98. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
99. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
100. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
101. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
102. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
103. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
104. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
105. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
106. *Montreal Transcript*, 3 June 1856.
107. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
108. *Ibid.*
109. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
110. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
111. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
112. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
113. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
114. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
115. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
116. *Ibid.*
117. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
118. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
119. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
120. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
121. *Ibid.*
122. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
123. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
124. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
125. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
126. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
127. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
128. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
129. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
130. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
131. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
132. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
133. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
134. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
135. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
136. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
137. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
138. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
139. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
140. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
141. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
142. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
143. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
144. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
145. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
146. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
147. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.

148. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
149. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
150. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
151. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
152. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
153. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
155. *Globe*, 29 May 1856.
156. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856.
157. *Globe*, 29 May 1856. Commentaries on the debate of this day and the reorganization of the Cabinet are reported in *Globe*, 29 May 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 29 May 1856, *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 30 May 1856, *Montreal Transcript*, 30 May 1856, *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856, and *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
158. *Montreal Gazette*, 30 May 1856, reports that "the House adjourned at midnight."

THURSDAY, 29 MAY 1856

(550)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Prévost*, — The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of *Terrebonne*.

By Mr. *Larwill*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Townships of *Camden* and *Zone*.

By Mr. *Crawford*, — The Petition of *David Wylie* and others, of *Brockville*.

By Mr. *Casault*, — The Petition of *Joseph Gosselin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Irénée*.

By the Honorable Mr. *Robinson*, — The Petition of the *Canadian Institute of Toronto*; and the Petition of *James Sanson* and others, of the Township of *Not[t]awasaga* and the Town of *Collingwood*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of *Luke Corcoran*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. Alphonse*; praying for aid to open out Roads in the rear of the Township of *Cathcart*.

Of *C. Dansereau* and others, of the Parish of *Verchères*; and of the Municipality of the Parish of *Ste. Marie de la Beauce*; praying that no further guarantee may be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Of the Reverend *P.H. Suzor* and others, of the Parish of *St. Christophe d'Arthabaska*; praying that the County of *Arthabaska* and the Township of *Somerset*, and other Townships, may be formed into a Judiciary District, of which the Village of *St. Christophe d'Arthabaska* be made the chief place.

Of the Municipality of the Township of *Eldon*; praying that Representation may be based upon Population.

On motion of Mr. *Hartman*, seconded by Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*,

Ordered, That the time for receiving Reports on Private or Local Bills be further extended to the tenth day of June next.

Mr. *Hartman*, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presented to the House the Nineteenth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have examined the Bill to incorporate the *British Bank of Canada*, and have agreed to recommend that the name of the proposed Bank be changed to the “Colonial Bank of *Canada*,” they have amended the said Bill accordingly, and report the same with other amendments, which they submit for the consideration of Your Honorable House.

The Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, “An Act to enable the Churchwardens of *St. George's Church* in the Town of *St. Catharines*, to sell and convey four acres of land originally purchased as a ‘site for a parsonage,’ and for other purposes,” they beg to report without any amendment.

A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fennings Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery:—

Mr. Speaker,

(551)

The Legislative Council have passed the following Bills, without Amendment; viz: —

Bill, intituled, “An Act for the construction of Water Works in the City of *Hamilton*.”

Bill, intituled, “An Act to incorporate the Town of *Clifton*.” And also,

The Legislative Council have passed a Bill, intituled, “An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Montreal* to borrow a sum of Fifty thousand pounds for the purpose of completing the new Water Works in the City of *Montreal*,” to which they desire the concurrence of this House: And also,

The Legislative Council have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Act to alter and amend the Act regulating the practice of the County Courts in *Upper Canada*, and to extend the Jurisdiction thereof," to which they desire the concurrence of this House.

And then he withdrew.

On motion of Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*, seconded by Mr. *Holton*,

Ordered, That the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Montreal* to borrow a sum of Fifty thousand pounds for the purpose of completing the new Water Works in the City of *Montreal*," be now read for the first time.

The Bill was accordingly read for the first time.

Ordered, That the Bill be now read a second time; and the Rules of this House suspended as regards the same.

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.¹

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

The House resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, on Monday last, proposed to be made to the Question, That the Orders of the day be now read; and which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing the regret of this House that the recent changes in the Administration are not such as to secure to the Constitutional Advisers of His Excellency the confidence of this House and of the Country" inserted instead thereof.

CAPT. RHODES rose to explain that in making the statements he had done on the previous day, respecting the Irish Roman Catholics in Lower Canada, the House had, he perceived, taken a false impression of his sentiments. He was not at all of opinion that the Irish Roman Catholics might be considered illiberal in their views of politics or other subjects.²

MR. ALLEYN was perfectly satisfied with the explanation, and hoped it would be a lesson to the hon. member for Megantic not to enter on definitions again in that House.³

SIR A. MACNAB said, I was very desirous, Mr. Speaker, to avail myself of the very latest opportunity that could be afforded me of offering a few remarks upon the state of the debate as it presented itself to the House last night, but from the weak state of my health I am afraid that I may not be able to remain so late this evening as I have on the preceding nights of this debate. I would therefore ask this House to be good enough to think of the several speeches made by hon. members in the course of the debate⁴, and to bear them in mind during the course of my remarks. I think it material to my object in placing myself right before the house and before the country, that the statements made by several hon. members yesterday should be borne in mind. I trust they will bear in mind these statements as they were made, and I shall probably be able to refresh their memorie[s] on the subject. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that Mr. Drummond, in his explanations, stated that Col. Tache informed him that he knew nothing of the arrangements made, as far as the members of the administration from Upper Canada were concerned — that they were all left to Attorney General Macdonald. Mr. Drummond also stated that he never was consulted about the changes so far as regards Upper Canada. He also stated, that at the Council Board on more than one occasion, he had implored the members of the Cabinet from Upper Canada, to put down the intrigues and caballing going on against the Premier, Sir Allan MacNab.⁵ These assertions made by Mr. Drummond were not contradicted by any of the members of the late administration, of which I was the President. Mr. Bowes, one of the hon. members for the city of

Toronto, stated that I was not deserted by a single Conservative vote, that night the want of confidence was given.⁶

MR. BOWES⁷ [OR] MR. BROWN. — With the exception of your own four personal friends.⁸

SIR A. MACNAB. — I am very happy to consider these gentlemen personal friends, although I don't know why they should be considered so more than any of the other Conservative members. Mr. Ferres, a gentleman who was at the meeting of Conservatives alluded to, and who I believe was instructed to communicate the results of that meeting to Attorney General Macdonald⁹, now the leader of the Assembly, also stated, that a report was put in circulation, that I was about to retire from the high position which I held in the Government¹⁰. Who put that report in circulation, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. (Hear, hear.) However it was used upon the occasion, and he [Mr. Ferres] was instructed to say to Mr. Macdonald, that on the event of my retiring, the Conservative party were prepared to give him their support. Mr. Felton said he was present at the meeting, and he stated that the object of that meeting was to get rid of the hon. and gallant knight.¹¹

MR. FELTON. — It was not the same meeting at which I was present; there is a distinction between the meeting at which I was present, and the one referred to by the gallant knight. I did not desire to say one word of what I witnessed at those meetings, except what was said on the floor of the house.¹²

SIR A. MACNAB. — It has been repeated to me by several gentlemen who were at that meeting, at which the communication was made by Mr. Ferres to Attorney General Macdonald, and they coincide with what has been said. It was also stated by Mr. Drummond.¹³ Col. Tache [also stated], that he handed over the entire arrangements for Upper Canada to Mr. Attorney General McDonald.¹⁴ The thing, therefore, comes to this. I received a message from the late Attorney General on Sunday. I think it was Sunday. The message had been sent up to me on Saturday, but I think it was Sunday ere I got it in consequence of my indisposition. That message stated that unless I retired from my position, by Monday, 3 o'clock, my Upper Canada colleagues would resign on the following day. Now, Sir, during the time I was ill, and confined to my bed — if any communication from the Executive Council or from a majority of the Conservative members¹⁵ had been sent to my bedside, saying that it would be to the advantage of the Government that I should retire — that from my being unable to attend in my place in the house, my holding a seat in the Cabinet was injurious to them — the same messenger who brought that communication would have taken back my resignation. (Cheers.) But I ascertained from pretty good authority, that a fire was directed against me from quarters from whence it was little expected. All I can say is, Mr. Speaker, that I am the last man to turn round under fire. (Cheers.)¹⁶ If the matter had been left open until after the close of the present Session¹⁷, I would myself have brought the question up, and if I had found that I was in the way, I should have taken the course which any man actuated by honorable feelings and a high sense of duty, would have taken; but the thing comes to this — I was supported by the Conservative members of this house, by their own showing, and the defection was on the part of the adherents of the hon. Postmaster General.¹⁸ The minority who induced the Ministry to hand in their resignation, did so in consequence of the defection of the supporters of the Postmaster General.¹⁹ Why they thought proper to find fault with me I do not know, but this I do know, that there is nothing which I undertook but I have religiously carried out — nothing which I undertook but what has been carried out to the fullest extent. Then I say it comes to this²⁰ — by whom was I removed from the position I held? I hold, sir, that I was removed by my Conservative colleagues in Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) The whole thing we are told was left with the Attorney General.²¹ Mr. Drummond had informed ... [the House] that the Lower Canadians knew nothing about it.²² I cannot but feel that I have been faithful to my colleagues. I have been faithful to my party ever since I became a member of Parliament. I defy them to show one instance where any consideration whatever, ever induced me to leave them at any time or place.

I cannot but feel then that when it was required that my political head was to be offered as a peace offering to the adherents of the Postmaster General, it was the duty of my Conservative colleagues — for that was my name, and I am not prepared to change it — I say, if I understand what is due to past sworn friends in an Executive Council — sworn to carry on the business of the country — it was the duty of the Inspector General — it was the duty of the Attorney General, now the leader of this House, to have said — I do not see why Sir Allan should be removed, he has fulfilled all his promises; there is no doubt that he is sick and unable to attend in his place, but although there is a defection in the ranks of the Postmaster General's adherents, that is no reason at all why we should desert Sir Allan²³ when he has been supported by every Conservative in the house²⁴. Is there one word in all the debates which says that fault was found with me. I read them carefully and do not find a word to that effect. I do think, and believe the people of this country will not think it a very extraordinary thing for a man who has been 26 years a member of parliament, and who has not been absent during all that time 30 days, that I should have been absent from my place a short time during this Session. But if I was absent by sickness it was the duty of these hon. gentlemen — unless good reason could have been shown to the contrary — to have stood by me. They should have said — if you drive Sir Allan out of the Government, who has all along been faithful to the trust reposed in him, it is our duty to retire with him. Had they done so that would have put an end to the matter at once. In the course of the debate the other day, I made some remarks which I have heard since were considered by the Inspector General to be of too severe a character. So far as I was concerned I did not intend anything of the kind. I had no such intention. I can assure this House and the country, that at a period like the present, perhaps, sir, the closing scene of my political connexion with the Inspector General, I should be the last man to do him an injustice. I would be the last man to do injustice to any of my late colleagues. I only desire to go before the country in such a way that they should understand the position in which I now stand. If I have descended from that proud position in which I was placed by the Conservatives of Upper Canada, I want them to understand why I should retire from it. I regret, Sir, the course my late colleagues have taken. I regret that a vote of this nature should have been brought up so soon after they took office. I regret the position they have taken for this reason, that if they retired from the Government in consequence of being²⁵ in a minority of six in Upper Canada, in what position will they be placed when they are in a minority of twelve? (hear, hear,) or in what position will they be if they are in a minority in the whole house. I have heard it said, that even if such were the case, they are prepared to change their opinion, and that they will not now retire even if there is a majority from Upper Canada against them? (Hear, hear.)²⁶ Well, I think they are wrong. I do not think that this House or this country will suffer them to hold their position an hour longer than the House has determined them in a minority. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I cannot ascribe my removal from that Council Board to any other reason than that I did not enjoy the confidence of my late colleagues. I may be wrong, but I can see no other reason for it²⁷; hon. members can judge of that themselves. For what reason I have lost the confidence of my late colleagues I do not know — I cannot help it. They cannot stand up here and say that in representing the Conservatives of this Province, that I should have retired from the Government because of the defection of some half dozen men supporting the Postmaster General who came into the Government as one of my colleagues. As I said before, I can ascribe it to no other reason. — They could have placed no value in me, they could not have had confidence in me. I must reciprocate the feeling, and tell them I have no confidence in them and I shall vote accordingly²⁸. (Hear, hear.) But in doing so, I must beg hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, who have been pleased on many occasions²⁹ to speak in a complimentary manner of me, that I thank them for doing so, but I tell them there is no change in my political opinions. (Cheers.) I have no desire to be identified with men who are called progressive conservatives or liberal progressives or whatever they call it. (Cheers and laughter.) I am called a Conservative, and I glory in the name. (Hear, hear and Cheers.) And I have no doubt that the Conservatives in the house will feel that I have acted right and will give me their support.³⁰ (Cheers.) If they do so I shall be satisfied: if they do not all I can say is, that I have acted according to the best of my judgment, and if I am mistaken it will be my misfortune, and those who vote against me will have the

advantage of all that they can make out of it.³¹ But I tell them the people of this country — who are a brave people, who are a sensitive and a just people — will be inclined to enquire why a man who has grown gray in the service of his country, why a man who has spent half a lifetime in this House, should be betrayed by the men³² with whom he has acted all his life³³, who upon all occasions placed him in the foreground — for I have never yet learned from any one of them that I have disgraced their favor. I have nothing more to add. If occasion require I will reserve myself to the last moment. You will observe that I have brought these matters up with a view to refresh the minds of hon. members, in order that my position, such as it is, may go [to] the country in its true state.³⁴ I have nothing more to add but that on all great questions coming from the Government that may be for the advantage of the country I shall give them my best support. I was pleased to hear the Inspector General say that he was prepared to bring down a Bill which should secure the completion of the Grand Trunk Railroad, and I trust that he will do so in a manner that will be a credit to the Government of such a country as this. I hope the Government will grapple with the question, because if they let the time pass they will inflict such an injury on that great work as I very much fear they cannot by any act of their own during the next session make up for. I shall be glad to see that bill brought down³⁵. I should have been glad therefore, if this vote of want of confidence had not been brought before the House until these gentlemen had had an opportunity of bringing down their measures upon this great question which the country is anxiously looking for, and which if brought down in that generous spirit which is expected of them, I will give them all the support in my power³⁶, notwithstanding the vote I am about to give on the present occasion.³⁷ (Applause.)³⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Although, Mr. Speaker, I have already addressed the house on the motion in your hands, I think, after the statement of the gallant knight, it will be allowed to me on my own behalf as well as on behalf of my friend the Inspector General,³⁹ to enter fully into the subject just treated of by the hon. and gallant Knight from Hamilton, in order to explain the whole course taken by myself and my hon. colleagues. I was sorely tempted to make this explanation long since, but in the absence of the hon. and gallant Knight, I felt that such a course would be injudicious. I therefore prefer(r)ed to endure all the attacks of this kind which had been so unsparingly heaped on myself and my colleagues in the late Administration, in the hope of getting such an opportunity of giving those explanations face to face to the late Premier, as that which now presents itself. And hope the House will bear with me in the explanation I am about to enter into. First of all, I would recount the circumstances under which I became connected, politically, with the late Premier.⁴⁰ From the time I entered Parliament I have acted with perfect accord with the hon. and gallant gentleman on every occasion. The first act of my political life was to vote for him as Speaker. When the Government, of which I formed a member on entering political life, was defeated, and we changed our places from the Ministerial Benches to those of the Opposition — at a meeting of the Conservative Opposition, the gallant knight was elected their leader, and I am sure he will say that from the time that Conservative Opposition was organized, till it became an Administration, he received my unswerving support. I think he will say that in all cases I was willing to follow him as my leader. On every occasion that we took a party move in which he was our leader, he received my support as the second or third. Whenever he made a motion or took a step, he was generally in the habit of consulting me, and I think that he will admit that on all occasions he had the command of whatever little abilities I might be presumed to possess, by aiding him in his course and giving an exposition of it. I fought under him in Opposition faithfully and truly, and that I acted completely to his satisfaction was proved by the circumstance that when he was called on to form an Administration, he asked me to join him as the head of the legal department of Upper Canada.⁴¹ I acceded to his request, and thought, while doing so, that I was only receiving the reward of my faithfulness and merits. For I will venture to assert, that if ever there was a faithful follower⁴² of the gallant knight, it was I, one who willingly acknowledged him as my leader, one who always set aside all pretensions of my own, and if I had an idea to suggest or course to propose for the benefit of the party, on no occasion did I make those suggestions my own, but consulted with the gallant knight, and gave him all the benefit of them.

On every occasion he was the mover and originator of every course, and any honour to be derived from it, any position in the country or in the house was gained by the hon. gentleman and not by me.⁴³ How, then, can I be charged with basely intriguing against the very man, who, above all others received, my most cordial and hearty support. The hon. and gallant knight stated that it was owing to the defection of his Conservative colleagues, the late Administration had been defeated. Now, I would remind that hon. gentleman, although he still claims the merit of remaining Conservative, that even in the formation of his late government, he found it necessary to discard in a great measure, the conservative element. Although, as he said, the representative of the conservative element, still he found that a government of a purely conservative character was not capable of successfully administering the affairs of the Province⁴⁴. And although he says that he cannot identify himself with those who are willing to sacrifice the name, yet he agreed with me in joining the Postmaster General and the liberals of Upper Canada⁴⁵, and the late hon. Speaker of the Upper Canada House to form a Cabinet of a composite character. It was only by adopting such a course that a Cabinet could be formed in which the Conservative[s] alone would be represented⁴⁶. Although the gallant knight says he cannot identify himself with those who have called themselves progressive liberals, yet when he came into power he agreed to take up liberal measures as well as I did, and joined with me and the Inspector General in forming a middle party, giving up the Clergy Reserves, the great point on which the Conservative party had been united, for the purpose of being in a position successfully to administer the affairs of the country.⁴⁷ It was clear then, that no Government, with a purely conservative policy, could have been formed, but it was found that after the portions of the Cabinet came to act together, there really were no important differences of opinion with respect to a general policy between them.⁴⁸ The only difference now is, that the hon. gentleman having committed himself just as much as the Inspector General and myself to progressive measures, still maintains the name of Conservative for the purpose of drawing a distinction in name, though there is no distinction in substance, between himself and myself.⁴⁹ The hon. and gallant knight, who boasted tonight of his converatism [sic], had asserted the other night that he was as liberal as any of his colleagues, that he had never opposed any of their most liberal measures, — of course, they had all alike assented, and all alike were entitled to the credit or blame of all measures of the government.⁵⁰ Therefore, when he now refuses to join with the progressive liberal party, he, in fact, repudiates his late policy in forming that great middle party, which had so successfully administered the affairs of the Province, under his leadership. And I have no hesitation in stating that, being leader of that Administration, he was fully responsible for all its measures — even the most liberal.⁵¹ There was a meeting to which allusion has been made, and at which my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Gamble) was present, held in Quebec before the formation of the present administration. As I was going to that meeting, I was informed that a number of the members of the conservative party, who had not hitherto been committed by any course they had adopted or party obligations within the walls of the house, had met for the purpose of considering what course they should adopt in Parliament. That meeting neither the gallant knight nor myself were invited to attend.⁵² But at the subsequent meeting in Sir Allan Macnab's bed-room, the course to be taken in the House by the Conservative party was finally decided on. Mr. Boulton attended at that meeting in Sir Allan's room, as deputy from the previous conservative meeting, along with other gentlemen, and announced that the conclusion come to by that meeting, to which, as I said before, neither Sir Allan nor I were invited — was, that while Sir Allan was to be the head of the party,⁵³ they desired that I should conduct its affairs, and be as it were its mouth-piece. For the accuracy of this statement, I can appeal to Mr. Burton, Mr. Powell, Dr. Clarke, and Mr. Gamble⁵⁴, who were, I believe, present. The hon. and gallant knight's reply on that occasion was that he was willing to assume any position in accordance with the interests of his party;⁵⁵ and I stated at that time just as I had done before, and have done since, that I had acted under that hon. gentleman from the time of the formation of the Conservative Opposition, that I would continue to do so, and that so long as he would lead I would follow. Mr. Hillyard Cameron said he was glad to hear me say so, and that it was what he would have expected me to say.⁵⁶ And I strictly followed out that course and acted under the hon. and gallant Knight [sic]. I made no pretensions as other men in my position might have

done, although fully sensible and proud of the compliment paid me by my political allies in making me their mouth-piece.⁵⁷ At the beginning of this session, the attention of the country and of the members of this house was called to an article in the *Leader*, written by whom or suggested by whom I have no means of knowing, stating that Mr. Hillyard Cameron had called a meeting of Conservatives — 11 or 12 members of the party — for a specific purpose, the general idea being conveyed that that purpose was to form a party for himself. — But before that article appeared or that meeting was held, Mr. Cameron came to me and asked what was to be the policy of the Government on Separate Schools. I told him what it was to be, and he said he was pleased to hear it, and had summoned a number of Conservative friends, not members of the Government, together for the purpose of consulting them on that question. — The hon. gentleman, therefore did not at all act clandestinely in the matter, as he told me of it beforehand.⁵⁸ The article which appeared in *The Leader*, however, excited considerable attention in the country and the House, as all such statements do.⁵⁹ The next thing I heard of steps being taken affecting the position of the gallant knight, the Postmaster General or myself, was that I was told by Mr. Burton that in consequence of these rumours, and the rumours that Sir Allan being confined to bed was about to resign, he had summoned a number of gentlemen⁶⁰ at luncheon to discuss the position of affairs. He asked him [Mr. Macdonald] whether he could attend, or if not, where they could find him afterwards. He had told that hon. gentleman they would find him at his office, and he might as well say here that none of these meetings were ever called at his instance, or suggestion, or desire.⁶¹ In the afternoon of that day, Mr. Burton, Mr. Rankin and Mr. Ferres came to me at my office. Mr. Ferres acted as spokesman, and said: “Mr. Macdonald, we have been appointed to see you. We represent a meeting assembled to-day of the Conservative party.” Mr. Rankin, I think, saying that he was at the meeting, although he did not consider himself to belong to the Conservative party⁶², but [he] had been invited there by a friend, and seeing that they held liberal views he had consented to accompany the deputation.⁶³ Mr. Ferres continued: “We have heard certain rumours of Sir Allan’s retirement. We do not know whether they are true or not. We do not ask you whether they are true or not. We do not suggest to you that we are dissatisfied with things as they are. But we have come to convey to you that, in case of Sir Allan retiring, in case of there being a re-construction, we have confidence in you, and will be satisfied with any re-construction in which you have a prominent position.” I replied that there was no foundation for any of those rumours, that I was exceedingly flattered by the compliment paid me; but that I could only repeat then what I had said before, that so long as Sir Allan would lead I would follow. Mr. Ferres went on further, and stated that among other subjects discussed at the meeting, was the complete unison of action and feeling that had grown up between the Conservatives who supported the Government, with some exceptions, and the great body of moderate Reformers who gave their support to the Government. He stated that all the great questions having been settled which formerly divided them as Conservatives and Reformers, they were anxious to form one great party, a middle common-sense — (laughter) — party. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at the term common sense⁶⁴. I am well aware that the idea of any party, saving their own, being a com[m]on sense party, appears to them excessively ridiculous.⁶⁵ But that was the nature of the communication made to me.⁶⁶ Mr. Ferres added on that occasion ... that so anxious were they to see this consolidation effected, they would not insist in any reconstruction whether a man had been formerly a Liberal or Conservative.⁶⁷ I expressed myself much pleased at the idea, and went for Mr. Spence to whom those hon. gentlemen re-stated this communication.⁶⁸ I think it was next day that the member for Essex (Mr. Rankin) came to me and stated that on consideration of what had happened, he thought it best to put in writing what had taken place, in a letter to Sir Allan McNab, and he showed me the letter in which he stated truly and accurately what took place.⁶⁹

MR. HOLTON. — Was this before or after the Duval case?⁷⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Long before.⁷¹

SIR A. MACNAB. — I did not get the letter till long after the meeting.⁷²

MR. RANKIN. — The Attorney General is mistaken. Some days elapsed before the letter was sent.⁷³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I had thought it was next day. The next thing I heard was that in consequence of the conversation to which I have just referred, there had been a joint meeting of the Conservatives and Reformers supporting the Government. I was not present at that meeting and had never heard of it till after it was met. That must have been the meeting of which the hon. member for Wolfe (Mr. Felton) spoke. But from conversations with gentlemen present at the meeting, I learned that a proposition had been made, which met with the approbation of several — how many I have never known — that a communication should be made to Sir Allan MacNab, that in their opinion he ought to retire. That was mentioned to me in this house by two or three gentlemen, and I took immediate steps to counteract it. It was intended to have another meeting next day, at which the letter to be sent should be signed by the gentlemen present. I asked Dr. Clarke immediately to go and see our friends, and prevent anything of the kind. I also saw the member for Niagara (Mr. Morrison), who had been at the meeting, and asked him by all means to avoid anything of the kind. And I made the same request to Mr. Roblin, Mr. Sidney Smith, and Mr. Ferres. All those gentlemen are my witnesses that I implored them that no attempt of the kind should be made till the end of the session, or till Sir Allan should be in his place. I said — “Wait till he is again in his place in the House, and then the responsibility will be yours to act as you like.” In consequence of the exertions I made, when those gentlemen met next day, they agreed to adjourn *sine die*.⁷⁴ Yet I am now charged with intriguing and caballing against that hon. gentleman. After that,⁷⁵ I heard of no further meeting or caucus of any kind, until the meeting held at the house of Mr. Beaty. Next day, Mr. Niles and Mr. Conger called at my office. Hon. John Ross was with me at the time; and as from the commencement of their statement I saw it affected the position of Mr. Spence also, I sent for him. They stated that they came from a meeting of Reformers, and that they wished to convey to me the information that circumstances might compel the Reform party to vote against the Government. They did not say that they were going to do so, but as they felt themselves under an implied obligation to support the Government, they wished to give timely notice, that they might not at some future time be charged with bad faith.⁷⁶ No other communication was then made to us. But a good deal of conversation took place. Among other things, it was stated⁷⁷ that many reformers objected to the name of Sir Allan MacNab at the head of the Government as likely to injure them with their constituents,⁷⁸ but that was in conversation, and formed no portion of the message, as I understood it.⁷⁹ They did not base their notice to quit on any more specific ground.⁸⁰ Upon this notice being given, the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Ross took place. But, although I felt at the time that notice was given, that the Coalition Government had received a fatal stab, that the probable consequence was that it could not last, when the Postmaster General might be at any time abandoned by his friends, yet I took a different course from that of the Speaker of the Upper House. I refused to accept that notice as an expression of want of confidence,⁸¹ because ... it was merely a notice that circumstances *might* induce them to withdraw their support⁸². I stated my ground for refusal on the floor of this house. I considered it would be cowardly for us to withdraw merely on such a notice, and for the same reason, the Postmaster General also held his position. Though he felt the grave importance of that announcement, that circumstances might at any time leave him as the sole representative in the Cabinet of the Liberal party, yet he felt with me that the only way that he could justify his retirement, was not to accept that notice of defeat, but to come down to this house and receive, with the rest of the Government, the verdict of this house, whether we were worthy or unworthy of confidence. As you may suppose, the Government was sadly shaken by the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Ross; and when Mr. Morrison took his place, he did it in the most chivalrous and manly spirit.⁸³ And in the absence of that hon. gentleman, I shall now state the reason why he accepted a seat in the Cabinet. Mr. Spence and myself strongly pressed him to do so, but⁸⁴ Mr. Morrison was disinclined to enter the Government — and I put the question to him in this way: — “Sir, you pressed Mr. Spence to join the Government at its formation, and offered him your confidence and support —

has he forfeited it?" "No." "You have also taken on yourself the responsibility of advising the Hon. Mr. Ross not to go out, and to advise Mr. Spence to remain, and you must show your confidence in your own advice, by joining us, and assisting to support the Administration." That argument weighed with him; and I believe that he then agreed to the proposal, originally made by Sir A. MacNab, that he should come into the Government. When the Government was threatened with the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Ross, for the purpose of supporting the Government, and keeping the member for Hamilton in his place at the head of the Government, I used every argument in my power; and the Postmaster General will remember that we spent hours after hours with Mr. Morrison for that purpose, and at length he consented to come in to the Government, and the Government of Sir A. MacNab remained firm. Then came the vote of want of confidence; and I appeal to all my Conservative friends, to the general supporters of the Government, and to Mr. Southwick, if he be here, if I did not use every argument, and all the influence in my humble power, to induce them to sustain the Government, and to vote confidence.⁸⁵ (Hear, hear.)⁸⁶

[Members] from the Opposition benches. — No doubt of it; we know it.⁸⁷

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Very well; hon. gentleman [sic] know it, and I am glad that they do know it. Then they know that I did everything in my power to sustain the Government of Sir A. MacNab. If I was desirous of putting Sir A. MacNab out, and obtaining [a] place for myself, is that the course I would have taken? I fought the ship to the last. No exertion was spared for the purpose of sustaining the Government. And if it was defeated at last, it was not by the vote of any one of those gentlemen who attended the first Conservative meeting.⁸⁸ None of the conservative friends of the Government deserted it. Had he [Mr. Macdonald] acted the base part attributed to him, how easy would it have been to have allowed them or instructed them to break down the Government. The Government lost their majority on that occasion in consequence of the withdrawal of their liberal supporters⁸⁹. That we were defeated on that occasion, however, is now a matter as much beyond dispute, as our subsequent resignation.⁹⁰ After that vote, we were put in an Upper Canada minority. And when I say that, I ask gentlemen opposite if they did not use every exertion to secure an Upper Canadian majority, for the purpose of contrasting the Upper Canada portion of the Administration with the Lower Canada portion of it, and for the purpose of saying that the Government, so far as Upper Canada was concerned, was a Coalition Government; while the Government, so far as Lower Canada was concerned, was a homogeneous one.⁹¹

Cheers ... [from the] Opposition.⁹²

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD:] Hon. gentlemen might cheer and laugh, but I never understood that the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and the member for Shefford, were of the Rouge party.⁹³

Cheers ... [from the] Opposition.⁹⁴

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD:] I always understood that they were of the orthodox French party.⁹⁵

MR. PAPIN. — I would ask if the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and the Commissioner of Public Works, were on the same ticket at the last election?⁹⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I cannot answer the question, because I do not know. When we found that we were in an Upper Canada minority, the Postmaster General very properly took that course that he said he would take when the Hon. Mr. Ross retired — that he would retire when a verdict was given against him in this house. He had before told me that he would do so.⁹⁷ In consequence ... [I] felt that the coalition Government was at an end.⁹⁸ And here I have to remark that when the

Government was originally formed by Sir Allan MacNab, he had himself admitted that no purely Conservative Government could be formed, and that it was necessary to obtain Liberal support. He called in the assistance and got the support of the Hincksite Liberals. Since that time he has not gained any accession of strength from the Conservative party. On the contrary, the member for Toronto and the member for Carleton, who had occasionally given their support to the Government, had latterly voted more often against it. Therefore, the Conservative support at the time the Hon. Mr. Ross retired was not stronger than it had been, but in my opinion was weaker. If then it was true that at the time of the formation of that Government a Conservative Government could not be formed, still less could a Conservative Government be formed when the Postmaster General resigned. The result was that the Government of Upper Canada was broken up by the retirement of those two gentlemen. Several gentlemen of the Liberal party had voted a continuance of their confidence — Mr. A. Morrison, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Conger, and, beyond all doubt, Mr. J.C. Morrison, if he had continued an independent member would have still continued his confidence; but it is not to be expected that those gentlemen would have continued their confidence to a purely Conservative Government. For these reasons, I retired.⁹⁹ The Inspector General and Solicitor General followed precisely the same course¹⁰⁰. Up to that time, I think I have clearly shown that, notwithstanding those caucuses and meetings, and rumours of dissatisfaction, and although I knew that dissatisfaction existed, I tried with all my energies to support things as they were and not to alter in any way the position of Sir Allan MacNab. But having come to the conclusion that the Coalition Government was broken up, I placed my resignation in the hands of the Premier; and I think no person will say that I was wrong. The Premier then had it in his power to form a new Government, he could have asked for the assistance of the member for Glengary or the member for London. He could have asked for the assistance of other gentlemen of the Reform party in the house or out of the house, if he chose; but he said, on our withdrawal, that he could not fill our places. I think that was the statement he made in the house.¹⁰¹

SIR A. MACNAB. — I said that the Governor General asked me if I could fill up their places so that the business of the country could be carried on without a dissolution. I said that I thought the places of those gentlemen could not be filled so as to allow the business of the country to go on. When a dissolution was spoken of all my colleagues were opposed to it. If I could have dissolved the house I should have known what to do. I should have known where to look for support. But they were opposed to it. The Lower Canadian portion of the Government argued that it would be wrong to send them back to their constituents, when they were supported by 9 to 3 of English and French gentlemen.¹⁰²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD asked when this conversation took place with the Governor General? Was it before the paper which had been read in the house was sent to the gallant knight.¹⁰³

SIR A. MACNAB. — I should state in justice to His Excellency, that His Excellency was not prepared to dissolve the house on a divided Cabinet.¹⁰⁴

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — His Excellency stated most distinctly that unless the retiring members of the Government were agreed as to the dissolution, the Cabinet should not be broken up.¹⁰⁵

SIR A. MACNAB. — I do not agree with the Postmaster General.¹⁰⁶

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — I am not sure how far it is according to the constitution of this country, to use the name of the Governor General in debate in this house. (Hear.)¹⁰⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD was most anxious to know when Sir A. MacNab was asked if he would fill up the places of the retiring members of the Cabinet?¹⁰⁸

SIR A. MACNAB. — I think it was before that paper was sent.¹⁰⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I have no doubt that that conversation took place previously. I cannot explain it because I do not know anything about it. Sir A. MacNab having stated that he was not prepared to fill up from this house the places of those gentlemen who had retired, the question of dissolution was discussed at a meeting of the Council, and the ground was taken unanimously and very properly by the Lower Canada section of the Cabinet, that they could not submit to a dissolution and go back to their constituents, and say that they had lost the confidence of the house¹¹⁰ [when] they had a majority of 23, and¹¹¹ when they are supported by three-fourths of the representatives of the people of Lower Canada. We all cordially agreed in this view. Sir A. MacNab did not express himself in favour of a dissolution. If he did, it was not in my hearing. The Government was broken up. I will say for myself, and the Inspector General, and the Solicitor General, that we were most anxious to support Sir A. MacNab. There was a strong pressure brought to bear from without. We were told by gentlemen in this house, but it would be improper for me to mention names, that if Sir A. MacNab retired, the union between Conservatives and Reformers could be maintained. But the Government was not broken up through any action of ours, or of the Conservative gentlemen who placed confidence in me¹¹². The avowed reason of the defection of several of the Postmaster General's friends was that the coalition had fulfilled its mission.¹¹³ And it was only after the coalition was broken up that I was a free man. I followed the member for Hamilton while he was a captain, and I was a subordinate; but after the desertion of the crew, it was impossible to go on with the Government, and I was a free man.¹¹⁴

MR. HOLTON. — Free as a party man? Free to leave your leader? (Order.)¹¹⁵

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I am speaking now particularly with reference to my position towards Sir Allan MacNab. I was perfectly at liberty to go into opposition with him or to join a new Government. I performed my portion of my obligations, of my promises, of my contract;¹¹⁶ and when ... [I] saw that a Government of the old conservative party was as impossible as before,¹¹⁷ I did not think I was acting improperly towards any man in the house, or my party, or the constituents that sent me here, to join the [new] Premier, when he asked me to aid him in forming a Government. The reason why he asked me to join him was, that he knew certain gentlemen in this house placed confidence in me. This was not a secret. It was as well known to him as to others. I am satisfied that I had a right to join him, that I was guilty of no breach of faith, of no breach of honour. I may be the most unjustifiable man in the world. I may have been imprudent. Heap as many such epithets and reproaches on me as you like; but this I contend, that having performed my portion of the contract, having stuck by my leader, having tried every means to keep the Cabinet together, that I had a right as a gentleman and a man of honour, to go into a new Government, with the Speaker of the Legislative Council, or any one else. As to the obligations I owe to the party that supported me, and the constituents who elected me, that is a question I am ready to answer to my country, and to my constituents. I hope that the vote which will be given will show that I have not lost the confidence of those gentlemen who formerly acted with me, and under the premiership of the hon. and gallant knight.¹¹⁸ He [Mr. Macdonald] was sure that the friends with whom he had heretofore acted would acquit him of wrong. If he had been desirous of setting up his claims to the highest position, he might have got men who had confidence, and he was proud to feel there were many such in the House to have played his game, but he had not done so. He could not be blind to what every one talked of. His Conservative friends came to him from time to time saying: Mr. So and So, and Mr. So and So, Liberals, are going to desert the government unless Sir Allan MacNab goes out. His answer had been ever the same.¹¹⁹ I have refrained as far as possible from saying a single word to wound the feelings of any hon. member, and especially of the hon. and gallant knight, a gentleman for whom I have always entertained, and now do, the most sincere respect. I could call witnesses to prove that I never, by any attempt, either in conversation or otherwise, tried to affect the position of the hon. and gallant knight. Had that hon. gentleman adopted a different course from that he did, the results might have been different; but he was perfectly justified in taking his own course. He could either have assented to a

reconstruction or not, as he chose; but I do not blame him for acting as he did, and I must say that I have not in any way tried to influence the withdrawal of the confidence of my Conservative party from the late government. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Murney) will do me the justice to confess that, and so would the hon. Mr. Cameron, were he here. They would be justified in asserting, that by no act of mine have I in any way produced the results which have followed. I have no more to say. I regret extremely that this house should have been so long occupied by the statements which I have made, but I am sure that, situated as I am, the house will excuse me. I thank the house for listening to me so patiently, and I have stated as nearly as I can all the circumstances of my case. I have submitted it just as it is, and it will be for the house and the country to judge of it.¹²⁰

MR. LORANGER. — I wish to ask the Attorney General whether, in future, he will call himself a Reformer or a Conservative. (Oh! oh! order! order!)¹²¹

MR. GAMBLE. — An hon. member who, last night, in addressing this house, after his speech in French, offered his explanations in English, in order that he might be understood by the English part of the members of this house, said that he felt great reluctance in addressing the house upon this subject. I do not feel so much reluctance in doing so, as I should have felt pain in giving a silent vote upon it; but the course I am about to pursue, which I take from sincere conviction and dispassionate judgment, is one so fraught with pain to myself — has produced such troubles in my mind — caused by the feelings of personal friendship which I entertained towards those with whom I have acted for a long series of years past, that I could not give such [a] silent vote. (Hear, hear.) But such conduct upon my part I could not justify before the country or those who sent me here. It is but the other day that I endeavoured, by my vote and my influence, to retain those very same gentlemen in their position, that they should continue in the administration of the affairs of this country. Those gentlemen thought fit however upon that occasion to [sic] resign, and with some two or three alterations, to resume their places, and it may appear strange to those who do not understand these questions, and to some of my constituents, that one day I should be endeavouring to uphold, and the next day to record my vote against them in a vote of want of confidence. Therefore it is necessary for my own sake that I should refer to many circumstances which have passed. I have listened attentively to the explanations of the hon. gentlemen. I have opened my ears wide because my heart was with them. It grieved me to think of the consequences of the course which I should be obliged to pursue, if their explanations were not such as would justify them before the country with respect to¹²² the course they have taken towards¹²³ the hon. and gallant knight who was at the head of the administration. The Attorney General West has alluded frequently in the course of his explanations to the meeting which took place in Quebec, and which he has now stated, and correctly, to have been held in Sir Allan's bed-room after Sir Allan had received communication from his Excellency to form an administration; a meeting where he stated to the Conservative party that he had received those instructions, and he requested to know the course which they were prepared to take. Upon that occasion (we had a long time to wait, I will allude to that hereafter) after we were assembled and Sir Allan had addressed the meeting, I think that the Hon. Mr. Cameron made the first statement. He said, that if Sir Allan could form an administration, that he for one had no personal objection whatever; that he was ready to take up his musket and do his duty in the ranks of the Conservatives. I think he was followed by the Solicitor General, and I spoke next, then the Attorney General West; and I said, as far as I can recollect, that as the hon. member for Toronto had stated that I had no personal objections whatever, that like him I thought, that if an administration could be formed and upon such principles as I could approve of, that I was satisfied to take up my musket and do duty in the ranks, and that I would support the hon. and gallant knight, with the reservation of certain measures, provided that the Government should be a progressive Government, and I think that there was distinct allusion made by me at the time to the extension of the elective principle to the Legislative Council.¹²⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I think there was.¹²⁵

MR. GAMBLE. — Yes. Other matters were discussed at that meeting. All the gentlemen present then gave in their adhesion, and subsequently the late administration was formed, but there was nothing said as to the particular shape which the administration was likely to assume, neither was the word "Coalition" used, and when the formation of that administration was announced to this house, and they had declared the policy they were going to pursue, and they had declared how the Government was to be carried on, and who were to constitute the members of the Cabinet, many of the gentlemen present at that meeting were just as much taken by surprise as any gentleman of the Opposition. The admission into the Cabinet of gentlemen of liberal politics was never submitted to that meeting, and never received the deliberate sanction of the members of the Conservative party. (Hear, hear.) But after the gallant knight had succeeded in forming that administration, and the declarations had been made of the course that they would pursue with regard to the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, Seigneurial Tenure Bill, and the extension of the elective principle to the Legislative Council, I then renewed the pledge that I had given formerly, namely, that with certain reservations, I would give that Government a generous support — an independent and generous support, but I did not mean by that, that I was going to give them a primary support, and surrender my private judgment, and vote for all the measures which they might suggest to the house, without ever being consulted by them previously. (Hear, hear.) But my intention was, that upon all questions involving the existence of the Government, that I should record my name in their favour, and I believe that if the journals of the house were turned over from the time of the formation of the administration until the resignation of the members, that with but one single exception I did that. That exceptional vote I gave upon an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton) to the Tariff Bill of the Inspector General, a motion which arose in consequence of the information said to have been furnished by the hon. gentleman who is now Attorney General East (Mr. Cartier) to his friends in Lower Canada, with regard to the time at which the proposed tariff was to go into operation. Now the reason why I gave that vote against them was simply this: — There was a plain charge made against that hon. gentleman, that in defiance of the oath that he had taken to keep these matters secret,¹²⁶ he made known to some of his Montreal friends the period the tariff would become operative. He had been over and over again called on to state the truth or falsity of that charge; yet he never condescended to reply¹²⁷; and I would ask any honest man how I could do otherwise than record my vote against the measure? (Hear, hear.)¹²⁸ Now, having shown that I have acted consistently at the time of the formation of the Administration, it only remains for me to state why it is that in the course of a day or two, my opinions have so materially changed, that I must now record my vote against them.¹²⁹ It is very true that the present are the same parties who have hitherto conducted the Government, with the exception of the addition of two gentlemen, one of them being my personal friend whom I have known for many years, and upon whose account I do most deeply regret that he should have allied himself with the present Administration. (Hear, hear.) These gentleman [sic] went out, and they returned again. By going out, they practically acknowledged their adhesion to the double majority system. (Hear, hear.) And they acted not in accordance with the interests of the country by so doing, for if you adopt that double majority system and carry it out, I should like to know by what means Representation based upon Population is ever to be obtained? Now, if there is one question which is most dear to the hearts of the people of Canada West it is that question, that they should be fairly represented according to their population. I have ever advocated it since the time of the Union, and I protested then as loudly as I could against the injustice done to Lower Canada by the then Representatives. But injustice will always come back upon the heads of the perpetrators of it. It was an unjust act to take the money of Lower Canada at the time of the Union, to be applied to the debts of Upper Canada. But what do we now behold? Why the population of Upper Canada is largely in excess of that of Lower, and we find that the very injustice that we perpetrated upon the people of Lower Canada, we are now writhing under ourselves. And as to having taken their money to pay our debts, it is very clear that at the present time at least two thirds of the revenue of the whole Province is contributed by Upper Canada, while the largest portion of it is distributed for public works in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) The injustice of our own acts had very

properly fallen back upon us; and I will take this opportunity of reminding hon. members from Lower Canada, that in all probability they will have to suffer in their turn for another piece of injustice which they perpetrated upon Upper Canada. When the Clergy Reserve question was before the country (hear, hear), the Church of England was in the hands altogether of the French Canadians; they could deal with us as they thought fit. It was not a matter of opinion, but of property, and they joined in the cry, and deprived the Church of her vested rights. (Hear, hear.) The late administration excluded the only Liberal man from Lower Canada in their ranks, who entertained liberal opinions upon representation by population.¹³⁰ That was a principle, however, which could not be long resisted, and by excluding from their counsels the late Attorney General East, they virtually denied that principle. Indeed, if he understood the present Attorney General East aright, he stated recently that it was a principle they could not maintain.¹³¹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — How did we exclude him? We would have been very happy to have his very valuable assistance.¹³²

MR. GAMBLE. — I wish the hon. gentleman had been as ready to follow that hon. member's example. The Attorney General West, too, was formerly in favor of that principle, and how is it possible that he can reconcile the course he then took to that which the present administration means to follow?¹³³ But the course taken by the Ex-Attorney General East was most manly, when he advised his colleagues to go in a body to the hon. and gallant knight, and inform him of their conclusions, and leave him then to decide that question. (Hear, hear.) And the Attorney General East stated as to the resignation, that while he for one would deprecate carrying on the government systematically by a majority of one section of the Province ruling the other, yet he did not think that a mere casual vote having that effect, was a sufficient reason for the resignation of the ministry, and especially at that moment.¹³⁴ It was an honest, straightforward, manly course which the hon. gentleman pursued.¹³⁵ (Hear, hear.)¹³⁶ But there is another reason why I cannot support the present administration. I do not think that the gentleman who is placed at the head of that administration [sic] will be acceptable to the people of Canada West. They are intensely bent upon the question of representation by population and the question of abolition of separate schools. The people of Upper Canada were also determined upon the abolition of separate schools; and, as if to insult the people of Canada West, they have introduced into the Cabinet the author of that atrocious school bill of last session, which they were not able to carry through. The reason why I gave the administration my general support, was because of former connection; old friendship, personal intercourse and community of feeling on political subjects, induced me to adhere to them to the last; but I cannot say, although I carried out that pledge, that I at all times felt satisfied with what they did. When I look back upon the formation of that administration — at the large majority by which they were sustained — I feel that they could have continued to have kept a position higher than that maintained by any previous Government in Canada. If they had [had] a wise and liberal policy — if they had given their time to the great interests of the country — if they had looked to its financial position — they might have occupied a very different position to what they do now. I felt then as I feel now, that in doing this, they were not governed by motives for the public good. When they had carried out the measures for which the coalition was formed — and I admit that they carried them out faithfully — then they appeared to halt; they seemed to be afraid of going any further. When they extended the elective principle to the Upper House, they did not extend it to county officers, who are employed and paid by the municipalities. And judging by the past what can I expect in the future.¹³⁷ They had added to their number Mr. Vankoughnet,¹³⁸ a gentleman with whose political opinions I am well acquainted, and I do not hesitate to say that they are ultra-Tory — a gentleman who, at the meetings of the League, had opposed the introduction of the elective principle into the Legislative Council, and I have never heard that he has receded from those principles. I know, too, that he condemned the Coalition Government for the course they took with regard to the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, and the Elective Legislative Council. What am I to think now of his having allied himself with them. But there is another matter which I expected the

Inspector General would have come down to the House with a remedial measure. It is perfectly true that the public accounts show that the Public Works are a burthen to the country, rather than a source of revenue; and I supposed that one of the objects of [sic] which the Inspector General would have turned his attention, was to find by what means they could be made a source of revenue. But such was not the case. Now, if the honorable Inspector General had been possessed of that power of mind, that comprehensive intellect absolutely necessary for the proper fulfilment of the duties of his office, no such important matter would have escaped his attention. He would have endeavored by every means in his power to make those great public works remunerative; improved our great natural highway for the trade and commerce of the country, and endeavored to turn the tide of emigration and traffic into the St. Lawrence. Such a statesmanlike course as that would have placed this country in a far more exalted position than that she now occupies. He might too have easily secured for the Province such an immense benefit. He might have sent agents to England, and shown, as was the fact, that that route was the shortest and best to the West, and thus we would have secured all the advantages of the traffic; the very vessels carrying the means of wealth and prosperity to our shores, would be glad to carry back with them to Europe, our surplus produce at ballast prices.¹³⁹

MR. ROBINSON. — They had sent agents.¹⁴⁰ Did not the traffic go by that route last year?¹⁴¹

MR. GAMBLE. — Yes, they had sent agents. It appeared that the hon. member was going to support the Administration; but if he did, he need not expect to be sent back by his constituents.¹⁴² (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The honorable gentleman was once a member of an Administration himself, and what was his conduct then? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But, as I was going to remark when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Simcoe, the first measure I heard of, from the honorable Inspector General, was the change in the tariff; and I say most decidedly that change was an unwise one. I know from the state of the public accounts, and from correspondence which took place with regard to the Grand Trunk, that we should have to pay the interest on the debentures, and I told the Inspector General that such would be the case, and that to tamper with the tariff under those circumstances would be most unwise. And what was the consequence?¹⁴³ He had to raise it again, and in so doing he departed from the previous policy in placing 30, 40 or 50 per cent. on articles which we cannot manufacture ourselves, and much less on articles which we can manufacture. I will not allude any further to the question of Railroad policy; but I do not believe that the Administration is prepared to come down with such a policy as will be satisfactory to the people of this country. I say that while the time of Ministers has not been employed in those great objects which should occupy their attention, it has been employed in endeavours to supplant each other and in caballing against each other. I have endeavoured to shut my eyes to the reports of this nature; but it appears to me that the evidence on which many of them rest is too true to be denied. Such at least is the conviction forced upon me by circumstances that have occurred during years back. Upon reviewing all these circumstances, and all which have occurred I am bound to think that these intrigues on the part of the Attorney General West have been of very long standing. It is my unwilling conviction that the commencement of these things must have been in the early part of last Parliament.¹⁴⁴

Six o'clock having arrived, the House adjourned.¹⁴⁵

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the chair at 8 o'clock.¹⁴⁶

MR. GAMBLE continued his remarks. He said — When the Speaker left the chair I was alluding to what I feared had been too truly stated in the papers and by general rumour that the time of the members of the Administration, particularly that of the Attorney General West, instead of being devoted to

the good of the country, had been devoted to intrigues for the purpose and with the intention of supplanting the Premier. I stated also that I feared that whatever might have been the outward conduct of the Attorney General West, there was reason or some cause at all events to believe that those intrigues were not of a recent date, and that I feared they could be traced back as far as the last Parliament, the first session of the last Parliament. And I alluded to a caucus meeting at which the Attorney General had moved a resolution of undiminished confidence in the hon. and gallant knight. The gallant knight was in great distress about certain articles which had appeared in the public prints, and the Attorney General called us together and proposed that resolution, that the gallant knight might rest satisfied that there was no disaffection among his adherents. I left Quebec immediately afterwards and came to the Upper Province, and then learned whatever might have been the seeming adhesion of the Attorney General West to the gallant knight, that if those articles did not emanate from him they at all events appeared with his consent and approbation. I did not believe it then, and can scarcely give credence to it now, although presented in a shape that challenged my belief. The Attorney General must know the truth in regard to this matter, and I trust he will state it on this floor.¹⁴⁷

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — When was that?¹⁴⁸

MR. GAMBLE. — I think in the first session of the last parliament. The Attorney General has alluded to a meeting previous to the formation of the last ministry, and he alluded also to another meeting that took place about the same time, called a meeting of the young Conservative party. Before the house met that day, I was made aware of this meeting, and was asked if I was going to attend it. I said I had never heard of it, and it was insinuated to me that it had been got up at the instance of the Attorney General West. But I could not then believe it; and after the statement that hon. gentleman has given to the house to-day, I am bound not to believe it. I was present at the other caucus meeting. I think the Attorney General was not present till an hour after it met. Then the gentlemen who, I suppose, had been attending the meeting of the young Conservative party came in, and after the gallant knight stated that he had been authorised to form an administration, one of the members of the young Conservative party got up and said they would prefer that the gallant knight should return to his Excellency, and say that he was not himself able to form an administration, but would request him to send for Mr. Macdonald, who was supported by the whole strength of the Conservative party. I was assured by various parties, directly and indirectly, that that meeting of young Conservatives was got up at the instance of the Attorney General. I hope and trust it was not. Yet all those circumstances rush into my mind, and it is not in my power to drive them away. Then another circumstance occurred. It was rumoured in the public prints, I think during the recess of the last Parliament, that it was the intention of the gallant knight to shelve himself with the Adjutant Generalship. This was publicly bruited abroad, and I understand that parties attributed that report to the Attorney General. I do not believe that, for the Attorney General denied it afterwards, and I could not believe that he could have been acting in that way to the gallant knight. Before this session commenced I learned from various sources that attempts were being made to drive the gallant knight from his position. I was sorry to hear it, but taking the matters which were stated to me, with what subsequently occurred and with the conduct of the Attorney General and the Inspector General, the circumstantial evidence appears to me to be in some respects irresistible. I wish I could disbelieve it. Had those hon. gentlemen, as the Attorney General states, stuck by the ship, and yielded that support to the gallant knight under those trying circumstances which they had pledged themselves to do at the outset, I do not anticipate that any such result as has happened now would have taken place.¹⁴⁹ It was the duty of that minister, notwithstanding the Upper Canadian majority, to have stood with Sir Allan, and thus have shown at once that there was no foundation for the rumors that had been spread abroad against him. But was that the conduct of the Attorney General and other ministers?¹⁵⁰ Their not adhering to the gallant knight, when the adverse Upper Canada vote was given, rather justified the rumours that were abroad that they had been acting together for the purpose of deposing the gallant knight. I must

confess that, when I look at the thing altogether, it strongly reminds me of a circumstance recorded in sacred writ, where a certain king sent orders to the captain of his host to place a certain individual in the fore-front of the hottest battle, and then retire from him that he might be smitten and die. (Hear, hear.)¹⁵¹ It gave him [Mr. Gamble] pain to say these ... things; but they must be said.¹⁵² There is another matter that, as a public man I am bound to speak of. When I consider that those gentlemen, placed in their high position, should be an example to the whole country, I cannot but allude to what occurred in this house in the altercations and discussions which arose in regard to the member for Lambton. If the Attorney General's speech has not been mis-reported, after using language and saying things that were perhaps unparliamentary, I think he taunted the member for Lambton with using the woman's privilege. Now, I think that the dignity of the Attorney General's office, and the dignity of their position as ministers, was sadly injured when that occurred, and I cannot but contrast it with the position the Attorney General occupied, when the member for Essex made an attack on him of no ordinary character, and when the matter was wound up by the member for Essex assuring the house that he could not express any regret for what he had said. I speak of those things because the Attorney General occupies so high and prominent a position before the country, and because I think the dignity of his position has suffered from what occurred on that occasion. There is another matter that I cannot but mention, because I think private and personal feelings have interfered with the public good, and because I think those private and personal feelings were allowed undue influence by the Attorney General West. I allude to the course pursued by him and the members of the Government with regard to the Municipal Bill introduced last session. If the Administration ever had a cordial and disinterested and effective supporter in this house, it was the member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron.) I know he had no motive whatever in undertaking that Municipal Bill, but the conviction that the Municipal Law ought to be revised and put into a state that every man could understand. He got a committee formed, and the Bill having been put into a perfect shape was brought down to the house, and there was no reason why it should not have passed. Although it had taken this house a week or a fortnight to have got the Bill through, it would have been time well spent, and would have shown that the members of the Administration had a due regard for the interests of the country. But what was the course pursued by the Attorney General West? He took ground against the Bill at once, although he had not even read it. We all remember the altercation that took place on the floor of this house at that time. A spirit of rivalry appeared to have got up between those gentlemen, and I must say that spirit of rivalry appeared to have originated with the Attorney General West, for my hon. friend, in reference to that Bill, had no motive but the public good, and had wrought at it night and day, while the Attorney General, not willing to take the necessary labour himself, was at the same time unwilling that the learned member for Toronto should have the credit of an act of that general utility.¹⁵³ He [Mr. Gamble] would also allude to the address to the Queen regarding the disabilities of the ... [Church of England], which was adopted by both Houses of the Legislature.¹⁵⁴ [He] accuse[d] the Attorney General of allowing his feeling of opposition to Mr. Cameron, to induce him to refuse his assistance to the measure introduced by that gentleman..., although it was to members of the Church of England that the Attorney General very much owed his position. The Attorney General also was absent when the vote was taken on that measure. He complained too of the manner in which the Attorney General had treated other measures connected with the Church, having kept a number of clergymen having claims for arrearages dancing attendance on the Executive Council and the Parliament for a lengthened period, without any satisfactory result; and when the despatches relating to Church Disabilities came from Mr. Labouchere, the government refused to take any action. Allusion had been frequently made to the adverse vote that the member for Toronto gave on the question of confidence in the government. He sincerely regretted that his hon. friend gave that vote, but he thought every allowance was to be made for mine [sic] in regard to it. That hon. gentleman had lost confidence in the members of the government, and had great cause to complain of the treatment he had received at their hands, not only with regard to the Municipal Bill, not only with regard to the address to the Queen, but with regard also to the most atrocious articles, attacking that hon. member, which appeared in the organ of the government. It was true that in some

respects they denied their responsibility, but those articles continued to be published, notwithstanding that they declared they did not sanction them. He had heard that those articles at all events met with the sanction and concurrence of the Attorney General.¹⁵⁵

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — No!¹⁵⁶

MR. GAMBLE was glad to hear the hon. gentleman deny it, and would he [sic] glad to hear the Attorney General himself deny it. The Government said they had no control over the paper, but after those atrocious attacks on his hon. friend, who was one of the most cordial and best supporters of the Government in the house, appeared, they conferred on the proprietor of that paper the office of Director of the Grand Trunk, and the Commissionership of the Lunatic Asylum, and thus stamped the concurrence and approbation of the Administration on those articles. If, under those circumstances, his hon. friend felt roused at the injustice with which he had been treated, there was every reason for ... it.¹⁵⁷ Before sitting down he would say that if he had caused pain to the gentleman whom he mentioned, he had also caused pain to himself. But as a public man he must speak about these things.¹⁵⁸ Mr. Gamble then sarcastically contrasted the description of the brotherly love which should prevail [sic] at the Council Board, given by the Attorney General East, with the state of things as they actually were. He complimented, however, certain members of the Government on their departmental management, and went on to condemn the present system of Responsible Government.¹⁵⁹ He would freely accord his testimony to the Postmaster General and the Commissioner of Crown Lands. But how does it come that those in whom we have confidence at one time, we lose that confidence in them in a short time after? It all lies in the system. The good sense of the country must sooner or later be brought to bear on the present system. A very long time had been wasted this session in motions of want of confidence; for no sooner were the government in their places, than a member rose to propose a vote of non-confidence.¹⁶⁰ He considered it would be much better if members of the Government held their places for a limited period of one, two, or four years, instead of being liable to constant motions of want of confidence. He called the good sense of the country to it, and asked whether that further extension of the elective principle which he advocated would not be best for this country. The action of this house should be controlled by some power above the legislature.¹⁶¹ He believed that the want of a written constitution was beginning to be felt throughout the country. And he hoped that the time would come when the highest office in the land would be made elective. The people would then be able to choose the men that they thought best qualified to fill their public offices. Then the power would be placed in the hands of the three branches of the legislature, which at present was held by one.¹⁶² Then we should have a Government that would discharge its duty, and then we should once and for all, get rid of those plottings and plannings to gain support, without which, under our present system, no government, no matter how honest it may be, can exist.¹⁶³

MR. WILSON said that the present Government called itself a new party, and said that it had a vigorous policy; but how was it that they had not that vigorous policy last week, and had no renovating power last week? They said that they were not a Coalition Government at all, but he could not find any distinction between a Coalition Government and a Government composed of gentlemen of different political views; yet, they were so moderate that they would not consent to take seats for the sake of getting into office. They had shuffled out two hon. gentlemen, and because they succeeded in accomplishing that, they speak of becoming a new party. — The recent resignation was a pretence, and their whole object was to shuffle out the member for Hamilton. They tried one plan and they did not succeed. They tried another and they did succeed. And in what better position do they now stand before the country? Did they suppose that any reform member who voted want of confidence before, will vote confidence now? He would take the description of the Government from a more honest man than any now sitting opposite him, — from the Premier of the Government — upon whose word no one throws any doubt. He said that after having called upon Attorney General Macdonald to assist him, he was told on the following

day by that gentleman, that his arrangements were nearly completed, that they were working out a new principle, going to form a new party composed of moderate Reformers and progressive Conservatives. They would have nothing to do with the Coalition party. The very description given of it showed it to be a Coalition, and the most absurd part of it was, that they were the very same men. One of the conditions on which the Government was formed was, that it should contain no Annexationists; yet, the present Provincial Secretary signed the celebrated Annexation manifest.¹⁶⁴

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — Where is the proof of that?¹⁶⁵

MR. WILSON. — It has never been denied.¹⁶⁶

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — I do not deny it.¹⁶⁷

MR. WILSON. — That is all I want.¹⁶⁸

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER wanted to know where the proof was.¹⁶⁹

MR. WILSON. — The proof is in the Provincial Secretary's Office. No one could deny that the present Provincial Secretary signed the Annexation manifests, and that he was called to account for it by the Government. Some reference had also been made to a speech delivered by the President of the Council at Kingston, in which he had advocated a peaceable separation from Britain. He supposed that was all that the Annexationists desired, a peaceable separation. — Now, Mr. Vankoughnet made that speech at Kingston, advocating peaceable separation.¹⁷⁰

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — No.¹⁷¹

MR. WILSON. — Does the Solicitor General deny it?¹⁷²

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH had anticipated that that attack would be made, and had obtained from Mr. Vankoughnet a note giving that statement the most positive contradiction.¹⁷³

MR. WILSON. — He did not deny it at the time.¹⁷⁴

MR. GAMBLE also wished to bear evidence to the truth. He had been present at the League, and he could state positively that Mr. Vankoughnet had said nothing of the kind attributed to him.¹⁷⁵

MR. WILSON would then admit it. Mr. Vankoughnet's own contradiction was sufficient. He had been misreported. But he would ask the Attorney General West if that gentleman had not positively refused to accept employment under the late Government.¹⁷⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD would explain that.¹⁷⁷

MR. WILSON. — Yes; let the Attorney General explain it, if he can. The Attorney General had been read a homily by the member for South York that he hoped he would bear in mind. What can the country think of a gentleman in the high position of a Cabinet charging a leading member of the Opposition with a serious crime — a crime which the Attorney General ought to have brought before the courts of law if he thought the charge could be established? The consequence is that a committee of this house has been occupied almost throughout the whole session with examining a charge which ought to have been [a] matter of legal investigation. He hoped that the Attorney General would in future, as the leader of this house, act with greater dignity than when he occupied the second place in it. He would say confidently that there never was a Government formed with so many false pretences, and which would have so little influence in the country. They imagine that because they have got rid of the member for Hamilton,

they have got rid of all their trouble; but their troubles have only commenced. They will find that instead of gaining strength they have lost it, and they will find that when the vote is taken. He was told, however, that although they resigned when they had a majority of the whole house, they now mean to keep their places if they have only a majority of one, and that one a Lower Canadian. That it is true, he had no doubt; for a more contemptible Government this country never saw.¹⁷⁸

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY thought it was perfectly clear to every hon. gentleman on his side of the house, that the hon. member for South York (Mr. Gamble) had been speaking as if under the consciousness that his constituents were watching his very words. But the charges which he had brought forward against the gentlemen forming the late administration were most unfounded. Some of them he (Mr. Cayley) would decline to reply to, as they were unworthy of it. But the hon. member was always ungrateful to his friends, and there was no truth in what the hon. gentleman had asserted. The hon. gentleman then replied generally to some of the assertions.¹⁷⁹ [He said] that he (Mr. C.) had once stood by his (Mr. G.'s) brother, to his own ruin.¹⁸⁰

MR. GAMBLE. — When was that?¹⁸¹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Ask your brother.¹⁸²

MR. GAMBLE. — Then I suppose I am accused of the great crime of having a brother?¹⁸³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY was proceeding when¹⁸⁴ —

MR. BROWN and others cried "Oh! Oh!"¹⁸⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — The member for Lambton may well cry "Oh!" He who turned upon the best friend he had in the world. He was ungrateful to the man who warmed him into life.¹⁸⁶

MR. BROWN. — Who was that?¹⁸⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Mr. Hincks, who procured for the member his splendid estate on the Great Western Railway, of which he was so proud.¹⁸⁸

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE called the Inspector General to order. These personal observations were quite out of place.¹⁸⁹

MR. BROWN denied that he had ever received any personal favor whatever from Mr. Hincks.¹⁹⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY concluded by saying that Mr. Beatty's [sic] nomination to the direction of the Grand Trunk had taken place previous to the attack on Mr. Cameron, which had appeared in the *Leader*.¹⁹¹

MR. MERRITT rose to draw public attention to the position of the country. The Attorney General had stated that the present Government was formed upon principles of common sense. If that were true, it was certainly an exception to the general rule. (Laughter.) As long as he had been a member of the parliament of the country, since 1841, every administration had been formed upon the very opposite principles. Was it common sense which induced the late administration to resign their seats with a 23 majority, and because that they had not a double majority? And upon what principle of common sense could they come back here, after turning only one of their number out. It was anything but common sense that had guided them. But the interests of the country were being sacrificed under such specimens of responsible government.¹⁹² Responsible Government was introduced by Mr. P. Thompson [sic], and it was understood that under it the Government was to come out with a blank sheet of paper, and the will of the people to be law. Instead of that the Governor had from that time to this governed by a Ministry.

Thus in '54 the country returned a large majority of liberal politicians, but what happened? Why, that Mr. Hincks advised Lord Elgin to call in Sir A. MacNab, then the very small minority of Upper Canada became a majority of two-thirds by being joined by the Lower Canada majority, and a small part of the majority from Upper Canada. It was by things of this kind that the people were defrauded of their right to self Government.¹⁹³ Measures were carried through to which the majority of the whole people was opposed, because that members were only responsible to the house. How were they going to carry on this Union? By having a majority of the house who can command the confidence of the people, or by double majorities? How were these parties to act in harmony? Instead [sic] of there having been harmony in this responsible government, it was quite the contrary. He did not care who took the reins, the same evils would be the result; and he believed that these were the last days of this system. (Hear, hear.)¹⁹⁴ The whole scheme of Government must be altered so as to leave the Ministry free to attend to their departmental duties.¹⁹⁵ The government had been repeatedly pressed to bring down their great measures, and among them the Grand Trunk Bill. Why had they not done it? No. He would not join in voting away any further money for this company, unless the country was to be wholly relieved from pressure by it; and the only way to accomplish the latter, would be for the government to go out of the company. (Hear, hear.) No member of the government should be in it. He had hoped to see a good measure brought before the house, to assist the completion of the road and to disembarass the country.¹⁹⁶

MR. BROWN. — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that as regards this debate, at least, the Opposition will be discharged from the complaint of taking up the time of the house. The discussion has been left very much in the hands of gentlemen opposite, and I think there can be but one opinion among hon. members of this house, that four days spent in a more painful manner¹⁹⁷, and in a manner most discreditable to this country¹⁹⁸, we have never before witnessed. (Hear.) What have we heard but a succession of accusations from one side, and recriminations from the other; charges of treachery from one member of the late Administration, answered by charges of double treachery from another; attempts at explanation from one side, and counter explanation from the other?¹⁹⁹ And yet the House was without a definite explanation of these alleged treacheries.²⁰⁰ I ask hon. members, if all the charges put together which have been made against the late Ministry by the Opposition amount to one tithe of the complaints offered by members and supporters of the late Administration against members of the late Cabinet? Could anything be more condemnatory of the members of that Administration than the statement made by²⁰¹ their late colleague the Attorney General East²⁰², that a member of the Council had withdrawn another member from the very Council table, and whispered together among themselves to the prejudice of a colleague? Could anything be more condemnatory?²⁰³

MR. DRUMMOND. — The hon. gentleman has misunderstood what I said.²⁰⁴ I did not say the members of the Council had done so. I appealed to them if I had not acted towards them in the most cordial manner — if I had any complaint to make I always made it openly²⁰⁵, and I would leave it to any of my colleagues to say if I ever took any member of the Council out to whisper into his ear anything I was afraid to say before the whole board. I did not accuse any member of the Council of doing so, and I did not mean to make any such accusation; (hear, hear;) I must say that all the members treated me with the same cordiality with which I have treated them. Perhaps, from the manner in which I spoke, the hon. member was misled as to my meaning. (Hear, hear.)²⁰⁶

MR. BROWN said he was under the impression from the manner in which the statements were made, that the hon. gentleman accused his colleagues of having done what he declared he was himself free from — and he (Mr. Brown) was not alone in that opinion. It was the general impression of the hon. gentlemen around him.²⁰⁷ I am very happy to have this explanation, and to know that what I understood to be charged by the hon. gentleman has not been the case. (Hear, hear.) But what do we hear from the hon. and gallant knight? That the day before the fatal division on the vote of want of confidence, a message was sent to him — to the Premier of the Government — that if he would resign his seat the

Government would be sustained by an Upper Canada majority; but if not, the Ministry would be beaten and the Postmaster General and others would resign! Is that the fact, or is it not? It is a point most necessary to be cleared up. If I have mis-stated the matter, I should like the gallant knight to correct me.²⁰⁸ Some of his friends had some doubts as to the date of that message; would the hon. member be kind enough to explain?²⁰⁹

SIR A. MACNAB. — I stated that the message was sent to me I thought on the Saturday, but I received it on Sunday — to the effect that if I did not retire from the government before three o'clock on Monday, my Upper Canada colleagues would resign on the Tuesday, the day following.²¹⁰

MR. BROWN. — Will the honorable and gallant knight say from whom that message came.²¹¹ Did the message come from Mr. Attorney General Macdonald?²¹²

SIR A. MACNAB. — The message came from Dr. King,²¹³ who said that he had been requested to bring the message by Dr. Herrick at the request of Mr. J.A. Macdonald.²¹⁴ I requested Dr. King to state in writing what the message was. My answer to it was, that it was an extraordinary message, which should have come through one of my colleagues, or from the Council itself, and that there must be some mistake about it. I also spoke to some of my colleagues, who said that they had heard nothing about it. The answer I got from Dr. King²¹⁵ I sent ... to Dr. Herrick, who acknowledged its correctness with the exception of some slight verbal alteration. The statement was as follows: —²¹⁶

“TORONTO, May 20, 1856.

“Between five and six o'clock on Sunday, the 18th instant, I was called upon by Dr. Herrick, who stated to me that he was requested by Mr. Attorney-General Macdonald to wait upon Sir Allan MacNab, and communicate to him that unless he resigned before three o'clock upon Monday, the vote would be against them from Upper Canada; and if he did not do so, the Upper Canada members of the Cabinet would resign on Tuesday morning; that he (Sir Allan) was the Marplot, and that they would get a majority of the Upper Canada members if he resigned; that Mr. Baldwin laid down the principle that if there was not a majority of members from Upper Canada, the U.C. members of the Cabinet should resign, as he had done on a former occasion; that there was no getting over now the principle laid down by Mr. Baldwin. Dr. Herrick stated that he advised Mr. Attorney Gen. Macdonald, that as he was not well acquainted with Sir Allan MacNab, the substance of his communication should be conveyed to Sir Allan through his physician and friend, Dr. King, which communication Dr. King made to Sir Allan on the same evening. Dr. Herrick called upon Dr. King for an answer to the communication on Monday forenoon. Dr. King gave Dr. Herrick Sir Allan's answer as given to him. Dr. King called upon Sir Allan on Monday, in consequence of his being called upon by Dr. Herrick for the answer. There being a Cabinet Council, Dr. King could not see Sir Allan, but called upon him on Tuesday, to communicate to him that he had been called upon for an answer, and also to state what answer he had given.

“JOHN KING, M.D.”²¹⁷

This communication was read amidst the manifest astonishment of nearly the whole House.²¹⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I am sorry that the gallant knight should have brought this letter forward. I never had any communication with Dr. King on the subject. If the gallant knight was going to use this letter, he should have sent it to me. It would have only been fair to me if he had done so.²¹⁹

SIR A. MACNAB repeated that he sent the statement to Dr. Herrick, and that gentleman had corroborated it, with the exception of the use of one word — Marplot.²²⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The true facts of the case are these —²²¹

MR. BROWN. — Ah! we shall get them truly at last!²²²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Instead of caballing against the honourable and gallant knight behind his back, I took care to let him know what was going on, and what the difficulty was. On Saturday, in consequence of the knowledge that we had, that the vote would be against us as far as Upper Canada was concerned, the Postmaster General and the Inspector General will recollect that I proposed that we should go to Sir Allan and have a discussion on the matter²²³, and state to him exactly the position of affairs.²²⁴ I was called away on special business on that day, and when I came back the party had broken up. Next morning, a number of gentlemen called at my house, from early morning until late in the afternoon. Among others was Dr. Herrick, who came to speak to me on matters relating to the University.²²⁵ Some five or six other gentlemen²²⁶ were then calling upon me; and a good deal of conversation took place as to the course the Government must pursue with regard to the vote on the motion of want of confidence, and it was mentioned as a general understanding, that if Sir Allan would resign, the Reform members would not vote against the Government. Among others, the member for Lennox and Addington was present. Dr. Herrick called me into another room, and after discussing affairs about the University, we spoke of the conversation in the other room, and of the likelihood that there would be an Upper Canadian majority against the Government, and that a great many Reform members had stated that Sir Allan MacNab was in the way, and that, if he retired, the result would be different. I understood from Dr. Herrick that he and Dr. King were the physicians of Sir Allan, and that they were both going together to see him. Dr. Herrick stated that he and Dr. King would have conversation with Sir Allan on the subject, or that he (Dr. Herrick) would see Dr. King, and that Dr. King would see Sir Allan. I take it that the caballing against Sir Allan was not sending him notice of what was going on. It was not to send him word of what I had heard was the talk of the day, and I should have had no objection if any other gentleman had been going to see Sir Allan. I deny, distinctly and positively, that I ever asked Dr. Herrick to convey to Sir Allan any message about his Upper Canada colleagues resigning at all. I deny that so distinctly and positively, that I must be convicted of falsehood if I am wrong.²²⁷ Dr. Herrick said he was going to Dr. King's²²⁸. I thought they were to go together to Sir Allan, and that the conversation we had had should be conveyed to Sir Allan, that the belief was that the Reform members would abandon the Government, if Sir Allan remained in it, and that the course of the Postmaster General was a matter of general remark; but as to his resigning or my resigning, I said nothing of the kind, as I had not made up my mind; nor did I know for certain that the Postmaster General, or the present Receiver General, would resign.²²⁹

MR. BROWN. — I think, sir, we have here a new phase of Responsible Government. Could anything more scandalous be imagined than these caballings, at last admitted by the hon. gentleman himself?²³⁰

A Member. — And on Sunday!²³¹

MR. BROWN. — Yes, on the Sabbath-day.²³²

Hear, hear, and sneering from DR. MASSON and several Lower Canada members.²³³

[MR. BROWN:] I do think it is a melancholy fact that in the Assembly of Canada respect for the holiest institution we all profess to recognize should be deemed fit subject for sneers and laughter.²³⁴

Hear, hear, and shouts from the same parties.²³⁵

[MR. BROWN] thought in the face of the public now witnessing them, more respect should be paid to that day. It was too grave a question to be so treated.²³⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I would ask one favour of the hon. member — only one — that he will allow the hon. member for South Wellington to explain what Dr. Herrick said to him on the subject.²³⁷

DR. CLARKE. — When this transaction took place — immediately after it took place — Dr. Herrick called on me and distinctly stated that he carried no message directly from Mr. Macdonald to Sir Allan.²³⁸

SIR A. MACNAB. — Nobody said that he did.²³⁹

[DR. CLARKE:] The subject occurred in common conversation²⁴⁰. He felt it his duty to mention to Dr. King, who was the attendant on the gallant knight, what had taken place, and that he conceived that it was necessary that some caution should be used in carrying a matter of such importance to that gentleman. That he did state that it was the opinion of the liberal portion of the cabinet, that unless Sir Allan resigned the vote would be against the Government, but if any other message was given, Dr. King must have mistaken him.²⁴¹

SIR A. MACNAB stated, with considerable emphasis, that in justice to Dr. King, he would state that he called on Sunday evening. Sir Allan's family were in the room. The Dr. said he had a communication to make to him, and that he should like to be private. The family were requested to retire, and then the Dr. made the statement which he had just read.²⁴² I took no kind of notice of it, but mentioned it to some of my colleagues, who seemed as much surprised as I was. At their suggestion²⁴³, in case there might be any mistake he [Sir Allan] sent a note to Dr. King asking him to put the message in writing. Having done so he asked him to send it to Dr. Herrick, that it might be read by him, and ascertain from him whether the statements were correct. This was done, and Dr. Herrick admitted all the facts stated in the note which he had just read to the House. He (Sir Allan) did not know whether Mr. Macdonald made that communication or no, but this he did know, that Dr. King told him he did so, and that he (Dr. King) was ready to make affidavit to the truth of his communication if necessary.²⁴⁴

MR. BROWN. — I think, Sir, the house must have great cause from these additional explanations, to repose confidence in the present Administration! Take even the least culpable view of it. Take it as the Attorney General himself desires to place it. He receives a communication from some of the supporters of the Government, that unless the Premier is put out of his place, the Administration will be outvoted. He has not the courage to speak face to face to his friend and leader — he does not even call the Council together, and state openly the facts — he does not think it his duty to the Representative of his Sovereign to go to him and tell him the true state of the case; but he gets a private friend to go to the Premier's bed chamber, and whisper the cabal clandestinely into his colleague's ear.²⁴⁵

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Hear, hear.²⁴⁶

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman cries "hear." I ask if he had any right to make the overthrow of his colleague and chief the subject of private conversation? I ask if it was right in him to make it a subject of gossip that a large section of the supporters of the Government were desirous of getting quit of its Premier? Was that a subject to be cried in the streets? Was it not a matter of State importance, to be listened to with reluctance, and discussed alone in the Council-chamber? And in the face of this disclosure, I ask what faith we can place in any statement of the Government? Has not the hon. gentleman again and again assured us solemnly that there was no caballing — no desire to turn out the gallant knight? And yet, here we have it beyond doubt, that he himself actually sent a message to the gallant knight, calling on him to resign under the penalty of breaking up the Administration! (Hear, hear.) Is it not proved clearly that the Attorney General did cabal against his leader? Does he not confess now that he

is forced to it, that he caballed with six gentlemen to eject him from the Cabinet. And who are those six gentlemen the hon. Attorney General talks of, who voted against the Government on Monday, but were prepared to vote confidence had Sir Allan been turned out?²⁴⁷

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The hon. member has mistaken me altogether. There were five or six gentlemen present at my house, and the thing was mentioned in the course of conversation. Mr. Roblin was the only member of this house present. The rest were gentlemen of Toronto, not members at all. Dr. Herrick was one of the six.²⁴⁸

MR. BROWN. — And so it seems the Attorney General made it a subject of gadding conversation among the citizens of Toronto that his chief and colleague must be ejected, or the administration would fall! (Hear, hear.) What could show more clearly than this, the utter disregard of good faith in the whole conduct of the Attorney General? I ask any hon. gentleman who sits in the same Cabinet with the Attorney General, how he knows that to-morrow his colleague may not be caballing against him, and whispering away his position and character as a statesman among the citizens of Toronto? (Hear, hear.) What did he tell them — that the Postmaster General would retire from the Government, unless the Premier was put out?²⁴⁹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — No, no.²⁵⁰

MR. BROWN. — What was the ground then, on which the message to Sir Allan rested? It was clearly not the Conservative supporters of the Government who were to withdraw their confidence, unless the gallant knight was put out.²⁵¹

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE. — Does the hon. member say that he understood from the Attorney General that the Postmaster stated that if the member for Hamilton did not retire, he, the Postmaster General, would retire?²⁵²

MR. BROWN. — The Attorney General said this, that the Postmaster General was determined to retire, unless the Government got an Upper Canada majority; and that there were supporters of the Government who said that, if the gallant knight did not retire, they would vote against them.²⁵³

MR. A. MORRISON. — Of whom I was one.²⁵⁴

MR. BROWN. — The member for Simcoe is one! And yet the member for Simcoe voted for the Government! (Laughter.)²⁵⁵

MR. A. MORRISON. — Yes! I will vote for anything to keep you out of office.²⁵⁶

MR. BROWN. — I have not the slightest doubt the hon. gentleman will do so. But I rather think he will have but a brief opportunity of voting against me or any one else. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But, Mr. Speaker, this is really a grave matter. Have not all the statements of caballings and treacheries which have been denied so persistently by the government, aye, denied up to this very night, being [sic] now proved beyond all shadow of doubt? Has it not been proved, not only that they tried to eject the gallant knight, but that they have actually been making it a gadding business through the streets, that the fate of the government hung on his ejection? (Hear, hear.) What faith can be placed in a government when treachery so flagrant attends its very birth? Well, sir, the hon. gentleman has succeeded in his design. He has got Sir Allan out, Mr. Vankoughnet reigns in his stead, and how much better off is the new administration than the one that has expired? Where are those votes that were to be obtained by the ejection of the Premier? Are they to be recorded to-night? Do we not all know, on the contrary, that the Upper Canada majority of six is now turned into fourteen? Will not the division list to-night show

an Upper Canada majority of 12 or 14 against the government? True, the Postmaster General told us that he did not know this — that he is utterly ignorant what the effect of the change of government has been on his supporters! Can this be true? Is it possible that all the hon. gentlemen on the other side allow themselves to be dragged helplessly at the heels of half a dozen ministers? Do they permit their leaders to break up one government and to form another without their having been in any way consulted? And will they still continue blindly to support them? Did they desire the ejection of the gallant knight, in order to get in a man unknown to political fame? I confess, sir, I never heard anything more insulting to the supporters of any government than the statement of the Postmaster General that he had not the least knowledge as to the support the Government will receive. What then becomes of our popular system of Government? Do hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches sit there from any virtue inherent in themselves — by right of their great talents — their superiority over other members of this house? I ask if they are not there simply to carry out their views so far as they agree with those of the hon. gentlemen who support them? Yet it seems they have made this change without consulting one of them. The governmental machinery of the country has been brought to a stand — a ministerial crisis has been brought on — and yet the very same parties come back to us, claiming a renewal of confidence, simply because they have ejected a member of the Government, who they say, was obnoxious to their supporters.²⁵⁷ Were the affairs of the country to be brought to a stand simply that hon. gentlemen might have an opportunity of putting out an hon. member who is obnoxious to them.²⁵⁸ I venture to say there is not a member of this house who does not know that the true reason has not yet been given why the gallant knight was put out. We all know that the gallant knight, for the last three or four months, has been made the scapegoat to bear away the political sins of the Administration and its Radical supporters. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen on the Liberal side of the Coalition have been habitually justifying their votes to their constituents, by saying — “We know we have given many bad votes — we know we have betrayed Reform principles — but it all comes from this Coalition. We are united with Lower Canada, and we are united with U.C. Toryism, and are compelled to do it. The Premier of the Government — Sir Allan MacNab — he is the Marplot, but if we had him once out it would be all right — and we are supporting the government in the certain expectation that very soon he will be out and a Liberal in his place.” This has been the tale harped upon for months — the gallant knight was the evil genius of the family, and all the rest were martyrs. But now, sir, the end of the tale has been reached — the hon. gentleman is out, and his colleagues all remain. But have they hinted at one new measure — one single step the new Government is prepared to make in advance of the ground occupied by the last? Nay, sir, has not the hon. and gallant knight defied his assailants to show one measure they suggested that he resisted, one step in advance they proposed to take that he was unwilling to take with them? And what think the Reform section of the Coalition of the exchange they have effected? They demanded a Liberal, and they have got one with a vengeance. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I ask hon. gentlemen opposite how they can submit to such a proceeding?²⁵⁹ What was there so eminent in the talents of Mr. Vankoughnet, that he should overtop all the conservatives.²⁶⁰ Are there not many consistent Conservatives in this house who were qualified to go into the Government? Was there not one man of all the gentlemen I see before me fit to fill the vacant office, that the Attorney General had to go out of the house for this new-fledged Conservative friend of his to thrust into the niche? Are the Conservative supporters of the Government content with this? Will the Reform supporters be able to delude their constituents with the idea that there has been any change for the better, because Tory Sir Allan has been put out, and is replaced by a Tory more Tory than himself? (Hear, hear.) But Mr. Speaker, what do we find further in this strange disclosure just made to us? By the communication of Dr. Herrick to the member for Hamilton, we find that the Attorney General not only communicated in gadding conversation to five or six persons, to us as yet unknown, that he was determined to eject his leader — but he communicated also the information that he and his colleagues had adopted the double majority principle, and following the example of Mr. Baldwin, were determined, if left in a sectional minority, to resign office, and there was no way of putting it aside. (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, they were left in a sectional minority, and they did resign; but they found a way of

putting their principl[es] aside, the very moment they got quit of the gallant knight. They were defeated by an Upper Canada majority of six; they resigned on the ground that with that majority against them, they could no longer conduct the affairs of the country; yet here we have them to-day attempting to proceed in a worse position than they ever occupied before. If they have thus shown themselves incapable of estimating their strength in this house, I ask how can they be capable of conducting the great affairs of the country? If they resigned when they were defeated by an Upper Canada majority of six — how can they remain after being defeated by twelve or fourteen, as they certainly will be to-night? Do they fancy they can keep their places in spite of such a vote? If they attempted to do so, in what a position would they be placed? Can they be regarded as statesmen, as men who look before them, who resign office one day on an avowed principle, and return to office the very next day and retain it in direct opposition to that principle? The whole end and object of the change has been to gain personal power to one individual, the hon. Attorney General West, to the sacrifice of all else. (Hear, hear.) There is one thing that must have been apparent during the whole of this debate. It has been conducted almost entirely on the Ministerial side, and every one must have noticed that nearly the whole time has been taken up with personal criminations. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have been now four days on their defence, and I ask if they have attempted to give us the slightest exposition of the views of the new Ministry, or of the policy and measures they intend to carry out? They have told us theirs is not to be a Tory Government, nor yet a Reform Government; they are to build up a new and middle party, without principles, without measures. They have not indicated one principle by which they are to be guided, one measure they are prepared to carry out. It is true the Postmaster General told us they were to be in opposition — to what? why, in opposition to the Opposition! (Laughter.) That is certainly a new position for a Government to occupy. They are to have no policy, no principles, no measures; they are simply to stand in opposition to what we may suggest. Sir, I apprehend that such an explanation will not be satisfactory to the country. The Government have lost two of their members, the gallant knight and the Attorney General East. Now, I appeal to hon. gentlemen whether the gallant knight, as a Conservative, did not possess more of the confidence of the Conservatives of Upper Canada than any other member of the Government? As regards Upper Canada, I apprehend, they have got quit of the only gentleman among them in whom Conservatives have any real confidence. And how is it as regards Eastern Canada? Can any one deny that the ex-Attorney General East was the bone and sinew of the Lower Canadian section of the Government? There are many differences between the hon. gentleman and myself in politics; but I must say there was no member of the Ministry who, to anything like the same extent, commanded our respect by his talent and the boldness with which he enunciated his principles. (Hear, hear.) He was certainly one of the most progressive men on that side of the house, and almost the only one to whom we could look for any liberal measure. Is it not the fact that the only really Liberal measure which has proceeded from that Government has come from that gentleman? I am quite sure that the confidence of the house in the Government is much lessened by that gentleman's retirement, and that the hon. member who has filled up the gap, much as we may respect him otherwise, can in no way fill the position which the Attorney General East occupied. And as leader of the Government, whom have we? The hon. Col. Tache. Can that gentleman be said to be of a progressive character? Can his name give any confidence either to Upper or Lower Canada that the measures of the Government will be in advance of those of his predecessors? No, sir, the hon. gentleman would look upon it as an impeachment of his position if we were to charge him with being a Liberal. And is it any indication that the Government is to be one in accordance with the wishes of the people, that its Premier is taken from the Legislative Council — a gentleman who has no constituency, who does not represent the popular will, but who sits there by virtue of a writ from the Crown. (Hear, hear.) When the gallant member for Hamilton was Premier we had at least this hold over him, that he had to go back to the people, that he sat here to represent the popular wish. But Col. Tache sits in a house which hon. gentlemen themselves have declared does not possess the confidence of the country, and which they do not intend shall possess it for eight years to come, when the elected Councillors shall be introduced into it. And with regard to the introduction

of Mr. Vankoughnet into the Cabinet, while we are all prepared to admit that he is a lawyer of high standing and a man of ability, must not every one feel that the strongest objections exist to his being put into such an office? We all know that on several occasions he has been a candidate for the popular favour — at least he has been often named as a probable candidate, but he could never secure even a formal nomination. And yet this gentleman is to be brought in over the heads of all the old members of the house, as a member of the government! Can it be possible that he is to sit in the Executive Council, without a constituency? The government have already taken a member of parliament into the Executive, without sending him to his constituents; are they now to go a step further and appoint, as a member of the Executive, a gentleman who has never had the approbation of the public conferred upon him, and who is not a member of either branch? I do think, sir, we were entitled to have had explanations ere this, whether Mr. Vankoughnet is now sitting in the Executive Council, and whether or not a constituency is to be found for him? (Hear, hear.) How is he to be provided with a seat? There is no vacancy at present in Upper Canada, and we ought to know how a vacancy is to be made for him. Which of the government supporters is to have the high honour of retiring to make way for him? (Hear, hear.) Mr. Vankoughnet is undoubtedly a good lawyer, but does it follow on that account that he is fit to be at the head of the Bureau of Agriculture? Is the hon. gentleman qualified to teach our farmers how they shall sow their wheat or make their lean cattle fat? Could there be anything more ridiculous, in such a country as this, than a government of twelve members, with no fewer than ten lawyers among them. Yes, sir, ten lawyers, one doctor, and an auctioneer? (Laughter.) Is a lawyer the fittest man to be placed at the head of the Board of Works, — a lawyer at the head of the Crown Land Department?²⁶¹

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — I am a printer, like yourself!²⁶²

MR. BROWN. — I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not any more than myself entitled to call himself a printer. It is an honourable profession; but, if I understand it rightly, the hon. gentleman belongs more properly to the legal profession.²⁶³

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — For the last twelve years, I have only practised at the bar for a year and a half.²⁶⁴

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman says he only practised for a year and a half, but I remember his being selected to get a tolerably large fee for conducting a public case in Quebec, and an hon. gentleman behind me says that the hon. Mr. Hincks offered him the Solicitor Generalship.²⁶⁵

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — That is not true.²⁶⁶

MR. BROWN. — Ah! well. I am quite sure the eminent talents which capacitated the hon. gentleman to jump at one bound, from his desk at Quebec into the management of the whole public lands of the country, opening up new and extensive territories and collecting the timber revenues of the Province, would have fully capacitated him to fill even the Solicitor Generalship, on eighteen months' practice — as well at least as the hon. gentleman who sits before him (Mr. Solicitor General Ross.)²⁶⁷

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. — The member for Lambton himself understands about lands.²⁶⁸

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman alludes to my connection with lands. The Inspector General also indulged in a similar allusion. The Inspector General said I was indebted to Mr. Hincks for certain lands I now possess, — that Mr. Hincks was the founder of my fortunes, and that notwithstanding I turned against him. In the course of the debate, it has also been stated that last session I acted upon committee of inquiry into the conduct of that gentleman, now the Governor of Barbadoes, in some way which was insinuated not to have been correct. Now, Sir, I have just this to say, that I never was indebted

to the Governor of Barbadoes, directly or indirectly in the slightest degree for any favour whatever. I never had a personal transaction of any kind with him in my life, and I think if the gentleman were here, he would not hesitate to acknowledge that any personal obligations between us were on his side rather than on mine. With regard to the committee of last session, I have allowed all those statements to pass without remark, Mr. Hincks being now gone. I cannot assail an absent man. Had he been here, and prepared to defend himself, the whole matter would have been brought to issue by a direct vote of this house. But he has gone from among us, and I thought it became me to let the matter drop. But this much I wish to say, in regard to the committee in question [sic], that I look back on my every proceeding in connection with it, with entire satisfaction; and I am satisfied that no one can dispassionately [sic] read the evidence adduced without coming to the same conclusion as the member for Montreal and myself — namely, that charges of the most grave character were established — that if ever a case of corruption was made out against a public man, such a case was made out against the Governor of Barbadoes. I regret being forced to make this statement; but the repeated attacks of hon. gentlemen compel me to do so — and I shall only add that I am prepared to meet any member on the floor of this house and establish what I have stated. But to return to the question before the house. I think, sir, we have to complain against the Government, that we have no explanation from them of the policy they intend to pursue. We must all recollect what were the great issues on which the recent vote of want of confidence turned? One of these was as to the Seat of Government. Is it possible that in that matter the present Government intended to carry out the policy of the last? Do they intend to carry the Seat of Government to Quebec, to the extreme end of the Lower Province, and to establish it permanently there?²⁶⁹

Cries of yes, yes.²⁷⁰

[MR. BROWN:] Hon. gentlemen from the Quebec district cry yes. I think they had better leave the Government to answer for themselves. I think we were entitled to have received from the administration a distinct statement of their views on this question. Are they prepared to take £275,000 or £300,000 of the public money, of which Upper Canada must pay some £225,000 to erect public buildings at Quebec for the permanent establishment of the Government at that place? If so, I think we ought to know it. If it is so, and the people of Upper Canada are to be dragged down to the extreme end of the country, that is a consideration which ought to govern the vote of many in this house. Then sir, I think we are entitled to know something in regard to the North Shore Railroad; I think we should be told whether four millions of acres of the public lands are to be taken by the Government from the public domain, and handed over to a private company — ²⁷¹

A Member. — Of course!²⁷²

MR. BROWN. — An hon. gentleman says, “of course.” Were that answer to be given by the Government I think it should influence this vote we are about to give. If this railroad is to get four millions of acres, are there not others holding equal claims? Is it possible that this North Shore Railroad shall be sustained by the public lands, simply because a party in this house league together and demand it as the price of their support of the Government?²⁷³

Hear, hear, from the Quebec members.²⁷⁴

[MR. BROWN:] Do we not know that the gentlemen crying hear, hear, were prepared but a few weeks ago to vote no confidence in the Government? And why are they to vote confidence to-night? Is it not because they expect to get these four millions of acres for the North Shore Railway? I ask those hon. gentlemen, if the Attorney General West or the Commissioner of Crown Lands were to rise now and tell them that they would not get those four millions of acres, what would they do?²⁷⁵

DR. MASSON. — Turn them out! (Laughter.)²⁷⁶

MR. BROWN. — Turn them out, says the gentleman and so say they all — and the Attorney General West laughs at the reply. Is such a confession [sic] by a number of the people's representatives a subject of laughter? Is it only a laughing matter that these gentlemen go to the Government, and demand as the price of their support that they shall have a large slice of the public domain, and that upon that condition and that only, they will keep ministers in their seats. Can hon. gentlemen deny that such a transaction is utterly demoralizing? These Quebec gentlemen give the Government their confidence and support, because in turn they are to have a tract of land. Hon. gentlemen opposite may by this means be enabled to keep their seats, but I appeal to the house whether our constitution can be sustained if such practices are permitted to exist under it? If gentlemen on that side of the house may band together and coerce the Government into granting what they demand to-day, may not gentlemen on this [side] of the house do the same to-morrow? Those gentlemen have got their price, and how do we know that those on this side may not take precisely the same means and with similar success. In four years we have raised the public debt from £5,000,000 to nearly £14,000,000 — where is this to end? Have we not seen the Government yielding to every demand for the purpose of retaining power and influence, and that the country in consequence is day by day being committed to new schemes and plunged more deeply into debt? I confess, sir, that nothing can show more clearly the strength of the demand by the member for Lincoln for some constitutional restriction on the power of the Government and of the Legislature. Long as I have contended for Responsible Government — long as I have insisted that British institutions are superior to the American system, I am driven to confess, by witnessing such things as we see here every day, that it is absolutely necessary to apply in this country some of those stringent restrictions which are not known to the British constitution. (Hear, hear.) I have been driven to this conclusion with no little reluctance; but it is only by the conviction that if we are to escape national bankruptcy, there must be some check placed on the reckless and ruinous rate at which we are accumulating burdens on the country. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Speaker, I think we are entitled to hear from the Inspector General some explanation of the course he intends to take in regard to the Grand Trunk. Does he intend to act on the scheme promulgated in his former letter to Mr. Napier? If they cannot tell us the nature of their scheme, what can we think of a Government which thinks explanations on a point of so much importance need not be laid before this house, and that all they need explain was the shifting of the men — the exclusion of one member from the Cabinet, and the introduction of another. The Inspector General tells us that £240,000 must be paid as the interest on the debentures lent to the Grand Trunk, but he ought to tell us how he means to get it back. He ought to tell us whether he intends to give a guarantee of profits to the stockholders, or if he intends to give £2,000,000 in preferential shares. If the Government felt the responsibility of their position, they would have come down to this house and placed their scheme formally before us. But they seem utterly indifferent to their own credit or to the interests of the country. The whole of this matter has been merely a question of a change of men — it has [sic] not been at all a question of measures. Sir, I ask the house to look back on the political history of this country for the last few years, and it will be found that this is the rock on which our late administrations one after another have gone to pieces. When the Reformers took office in 1843, they had certain great measures to place before the country; even while the Conservatives held office in Lord Metcalfe's time, they asked to be judged by their measures; the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government of 1848, again rested upon their measures; but since then there has been a complete change. The coalition principle was first inaugurated in 1851, and I am sure that nobody will now deny that ever since then, the strife has been to form combinations strong enough to obtain the seals, but with a very secondary reference to the adoption of public measures. I am sure that if the member for Hamilton were to speak his sincere and honest convictions he would tell us to-night that he regrets deeply having entered the Coalition Government. Will that hon. gentleman deny that by entering that Government he sacrificed certain great principles he had long entertained? It is true that he has borrowed some old topics of discussion from the political arena — but has the peculiar settlement of those measures been satisfactory to any one — has the end of the coalition been satisfactory to himself or to his party? Have the members of the coalition ever had confidence in each other? Have

they not been constantly squabbling with each other? Have they satisfied any one section of their supporters? Sir, I apprehend the day of coalitions has come to an end in Canada. Is it not clear that when members of this house take office, they should only do so to carry out the principles and measures they advocated at the hustings and in Opposition — and that they should not go in merely for the purpose of keeping others out? (Cheers.) The Postmaster General has said that the coalition has passed away; and in one sense this is true; it has passed away because he, as the representative of our section, has lost all his supporters but two or three — (Hear, hear); — but can the Postmaster General say that there is not now the same sacrifice of principle in the Cabinet to please both parties in Upper Canada, and both sections of the Province? Will he point out any one great public measure on which they can agree? Not one. They have failed to offer any such to the house, and are content to tell us that they are middle men — that they take a common sense view of the affairs of the country. They have no policy, they have no principle. Suppose there were to be a general election to-morrow, and they had to go to their constituents, I ask hon. gentlemen upon what they would then stand? I do not speak of mere minor measures, but of those great public measures which give character to an administration. Have they one? And when the Postmaster General tells us that the Reform party is no longer in existence — that there are no Reform issues now worthy of consideration, I think he will find, when he goes down to his constituents, that there are issues now before the country of as great importance, in their estimation, as any that ever agitated it. When he tells his constituents that the Government has no policy, but to oppose the Opposition, he will find that they know more about the affairs of the country than he does himself. How can we possibly carry on this Union, if we continue to act as we are doing now? This one issue, I apprehend, involves questions of more importance — of greater magnitude — than any we ever had before. Is it not clear that Upper Canada and Lower Canada entertain different views on various subjects? Is it not clear that Lower Canada demands many things which Upper Canada is not disposed to grant? Is it not clear that concessions are demanded by one section of the Province, which place any Government yielding them, in antagonism with the people of the other? And yet, although there is distrust and disunion between the two sections of the Province, and one Government after another is broken down in consequence, this Government which has come in, says it does not intend to grapple with the difficulty, but that it intends merely to oppose the Opposition! I think we are entitled to demand at their hands some solution of this great sectional question. I think that if the Attorney General West had been the statesman that he aspires to be — if he were the man of enlarged ideas he ought to be — he would, at least, have tried to grapple with the difficulty — to seek out those causes of difference between Upper and Lower Canada, and apply that remedy which is urgently demanded. I think, if he had looked into the causes, he would have found that the people of Upper Canada will never be satisfied until representation in this country is based on population. They have put it on record, over and over again, that that is the only true basis of representation. They are urging us on upon this question, and will not be satisfied until this object is gained. Sir, I will ask the members of Lower Canada how their people would like to be subjected to such an unjust division of the representation as the people of Upper Canada now complain of? How would they like, if, with an excess of three hundred thousand population, and that excess [sic] constantly increasing, to have Parliamentary representation no larger than Upper Canada? How would they like such a state of things to exist? — how long would they endure it? And yet, here is a new Government, formed without any attempt to grapple with the difficulty! Then, with regard to other questions: There is the School question — one much agitated here. I think we ought to have some mode proposed of settling that question, and dismissing it for ever from this arena. It is quite clear that, so long as this and other similar questions remain unsettled, there can be no harmony between Upper and Lower Canada. I think the government ought to deal boldly with this question, and decide, as the only possible basis, that the different denominations should be left solely to their own support. That is the only sensible conclusion we can arrive at, and then all the criminations between Upper and Lower Canada would be put an end to at once. I have been accused, during this debate, of exciting religious discord, and fomenting divisions between Upper and Lower Canada; but I apprehend, if the truth were looked into, that it would be found

I am the man who can most justly claim credit for desiring to see these questions of discord removed from us for ever.²⁷⁷

Ironical cheers from the French members.²⁷⁸

[MR. BROWN continued:] I am charged with trying to put the Roman Catholics down. (Yes!) Then I say that a more unfounded charge could not be made against me.²⁷⁹

DR. MASSON. — You have not read the *Globe* then.²⁸⁰

MR. BROWN. — I defy the hon. gentleman to find in the *Globe* one single sentiment which would justify [sic] that charge. The hon. gentleman will find that the full extent of what I demand, or have ever demanded, is that the voluntary principle shall be carried out in the government of this country — that every denomination shall be left to legislate for itself and support itself, — and that we shall exclude religious questions at once and for ever from discussion on the floor of this house.²⁸¹

DR. MASSON. — You alone think so.²⁸²

MR. BROWN. — I tell the hon. gentleman that the people of Upper Canada, from one end of it to the other, entertain the same feelings on these questions that I do. What makes me the constant theme of ministerial speeches, the object of their bitterest attacks? What gives me any power here, but that I represent the views of the people of Upper Canada on these subjects? Hon. gentlemen must see that this question cannot be evaded, and that it is infinitely better to look it boldly in the face and settle it, than keep it constantly rankling in our political area, and breaking down one public man after another. I must say I have a feeling of pity for every public man who goes into the government, knowing that when he goes to the hustings he will be asked what he will do on Representation by Population, what on the Separate School question, what on the sectarian money votes, and on all those questions which divide the people of the two sections. If he is to be returned, he must give satisfactory assurances on all these questions, and just as surely as he does so, he will break them all when he takes his seat on the treasury benches. Can there be anything more demoralizing for our public men than to be subjected to such a system? Can there be anything more demoralizing in its effects upon the public mind than such a spectacle as the Postmaster General, for example, exhibited, pledging himself to a platform at Halton of the most ultra-Radical character, and forgetting all about it when he takes his seat on the treasury benches? I know that it is difficult for gentlemen of Lower Canada to understand the full force of the feeling in Upper Canada, because they always persist until they succeed in getting every important local question of theirs settled. Let us look the matter fairly in the face like wise men — let us consider deliberately the remedy to be applied — and if it is really so that we cannot find a common basis of agreement, on which we can carry on the business of the country harmoniously, then, sir, I say it is better to part by dissolving the Union — (cheers) — at once. If ministers have to resign upon this vote — and I cannot believe that they will dare to sit on the treasury benches as a Government after this night — for they can obtain, at most, a majority of two or three — this may be the last time I will address the house before going back to our constituents — and I desire to make it my last effort, as it was my first, on the floor of Parliament, to entreat hon. gentlemen to turn their thoughts earnestly to the discovery of some wise mode of remedying for ever the discordances between Upper and Lower Canada. Unless we can devise one I am driven to the conclusion that it will be utterly impossible to carry on the Union. And much as I regret that that should be the alternative, yet I want gentlemen from Lower Canada to take this with them, that we have no other alternative but a dissolution of the connection. Sir, I trust no hon. gentleman will imagine that I entertain feelings of personal hostility towards any Roman Catholic, or any French Canadian, because I urge these matters strongly. The course I have pursued in this house had laid me open to these charges²⁸³. [But] he [Mr. Brown] had taken his stand against the system, because he had no hope of peace and

prosperity to the country until all churches were supported on the voluntary principle. Hon. gentlemen were aware that long before he had a seat in the House, he took an active part in the policy of the country, and since he came into the House he had pursued the course there marked out from a painful sense of public duty.²⁸⁴ Years ago I saw that whenever any question relating to religion came up, that whenever the R. Catholic Church exerted its influence, it was sure to succeed — resistance was at an end. Painful though I knew it would be, I resolved to use every exertion to break down so injurious an influence in our political affairs. I entertain no hostile feelings towards any gentleman from Lower Canada. If I have often spoken plainly, it has not been from personal feeling. I would be the last to deny to them one right, or one privilege, which any other enjoys; but I would, too, be the last to grant them one right — one privilege — that is denied to any and every other citizen of the country. We can never consent to occupy in Upper Canada, an inferior position to that enjoyed by Lower Canada. I would have all to stand on a perfectly equal footing. Hon. gentlemen have talked about the waste of public time. It is these constant sectional discussions that waste time. Is it not clear that, if you continue that system of bribing religious denominations in order to obtain parliamentary support, it must go on from day to day, and from year to year, impeding legislative action, and diverting discussion from the ordinary business of the country to religious discussions, exciting religious dissensions, demoralizing religious principle, and bringing it down to the level of paltry politics? (Cheers.) I ask hon. gentlemen to consider this, and to seek to ascertain whether it is not possible to get rid of these religious discussions for ever, and put the affairs of the country on a far more satisfactory footing.²⁸⁵ It was from a heartfelt conviction of public duty that he [Mr. Brown] had contended that these questions should be removed out of the way, that they might not be constantly rankling in the public mind. These were the questions that wasted the time of the House, and he begged hon. gentlemen to consider that that was the opinion he occupied. It was painful for him to occupy it, but there was nothing of personal feeling. If these difficulties can be removed, let them go deliberately to the task — let them not remain in the way that our public men may be demoralized and our whole institutions brought into contempt. Did they ask any more than their right?²⁸⁶ All we demand in Upper Canada is to be placed on an equal footing. We ask do [sic] more, we will take no less. (Loud and continued cheers.)²⁸⁷

MR. ROBINSON said he was never more surprised in his life than when the member for South York had made such a furious attack on him. He had done nothing to call it forth, and he would beg to call the attention of the house to what he did say. The excitement of the member for South York was so great that one of his friends had crossed the room, and asked him if he had said anything personally offensive to that gentleman. As others might think that this was the case he would explain that the member for South York was going on to accuse the Government of neglect to the interests of the country, and more particularly neglecting the encouragement of emigration by this route to the Far West, and he [Mr. Robinson] merely said great numbers came last year, when the hon. gentleman blew out at him, and said, “you intend to vote for the Government, if you do you will lose your seat. What did you do when you were in the Government?” A pretty question truly to put to an old friend. If anything was wanting to convince him that the hon. gentleman was delivering a set speech, a regular stall fed speech, it was the rage he fell into at being interrupted. He could tell the hon. gentleman who informed him that he would not be elected again, that it was something very like impertinence to intimate to him or any one else that he would not be elected again. He entertained no fears of losing his seat. He had been in Parliament almost as long as his gallant friend from Hamilton²⁸⁸. He had entered this House twenty-six years ago, and with the exception of two years he had been in it ever since²⁸⁹, and had been elected for his county over and over again. But he must say that it was something very like impertinence in the hon. member who lives so near his constituents, and stands well with a good many of them to tell him that he would lose his seat.²⁹⁰ If the facts of the case were known it would be found that the hon. member for South York was a great deal more anxious about his constituency than he (Mr. Robinson) was about his. He could not account for the hon. gentleman’s rage to-night at all. The Ministry had fulfilled the promises

made at their formation. The hon. gentleman had voted for them when the vote of want of confidence was taken, and he did not know that any thing had happened since that to cause him to change his opinions.²⁹¹ As to the effect of voting against this motion, he [Mr. Robinson] was not influenced by any fears of the kind the hon. gentleman wished to impress on him. He voted for or against every motion that came before him, just as that motion seemed to him justifiable or not. And he would say, that he thought the Attorney General West defended himself very successfully from the charges made against him. He had named the persons who were present at the different interviews, and had called on them to affirm or deny the truth of his statements, and not one rose to deny what he had said, and he, therefore, supposed that they were correct. He regretted extremely to see that the late Attorney General East and his gallant friend the late Premier, were out of the government; but this he would say, that if some of the members of the Administration had paid the same attention to the duties of their departments as had been paid to his duty by the late Premier, he would vote for them now with more satisfaction than he did. But even on that point, he thought the member for South York had paid a very high tribute to the fitness of the Ministry for discharging their duties. If that hon. gentleman could give as good a reason for his vote as he himself could for the vote he was about to give, it would be well for him, but he thought it must have struck every one that almost everything the honourable gentleman had said applied to things that were long gone by. He had great faith in the gentleman selected to fill the Premier's place. As to the hon. member for Lambton's assertion that Mr. Vankoughnet had not the power of being called to a constituency, he (Mr. R.) could upon the contrary declare that that gentleman could have obtained the nomination of several constituencies long ago, if he had pleased to put himself up. He (Mr. R.) need not say that he wished the gentleman himself had been here, for he entertained the opinion that he possessed talent of no ordinary kind. He (Mr. R.) had been taunted as to what he had done when in the Board of Works. He never had heard any complaint of that. When he came in he found an enormous amount of business awaiting disposal. He attended to it, and, he felt, with satisfactory results. No objections had been brought forward to his expenditure of the money of that department, and it ill became the member for South York to thus taunt him by asking, "What did you do when you were there?" — (emphatically.) (Laughter.) And the hon. member for Lambton had said that Responsible Government could not stand in Canada longer. That was not the fault of those gentlemen now in office. The cry formerly was in favour of it, and many who now called out against it, had left their old ideas on the subject. But the fact was that the Opposition gentlemen wanted to jump into the seats of those on his side. The Reformers had been in possession ten or eleven years out of fourteen or fifteen of Responsible Government in the administrations of the country, and the hon. and gallant knight and others must remember the pretensions of those gentlemen to honesty, if the family compact and others were only out of the way. That they, in fact, were those Hampdens and patriots alluded to by the poet Gray in his celebrated poem of "The Elegy," (nothing ominous he hoped in the word "Elegy") that they and only they were able

The applause of listening Senates to command,

The *pelf* of *place* and power to despise,

To scatter plenty o'er a smiling Land,

And read their history in a nation's *eyes*.

(Hear, hear, and laughter.) There was also another part of that poem applicable to the hon. gentlemen opposite, which he would also quote as follows: —

"For who to dumb forgetfulness a prey,

Those pleasing anxious benches o'er resign'd,

Left their warm precincts, and still warmer pay,

Nor cast one longing ling'ring look behind?"

(Laughter, and "Shakespeare.") He intended to vote against the motion, and thought that in doing so he was acting consistently.²⁹²

MR. MARCHILDON then enlivened the debate by his usual discursive elocution.²⁹³

MR. O'FARRELL did not think that the position of the government was so much altered by the recent changes, as to cause him to lose confidence in them. He then went on to speak in reply to some remarks personal to himself, made by Captain Rhodes²⁹⁴ on the previous evening.... He was sure that that gentleman had spoken the sentiments of his heart, when he had stated to the House, that the Irish Roman Catholics were essentially illiberal. That gentleman to show his extreme liberality, advertised for a servant some time ago, and at the bottom of the advertisement inserted, "none but Protestants need apply." When Mr. Rhodes made his attack on the Irish, he had only been answered by Mr. Alleyn, and he (Mr. O'Farrell) begged to thank that gentleman for standing up to defend the Irish Roman Catholics. It had been stated by Mr. Rhodes, that he (Mr. O'Farrell) had been a tenant of the Crown Land Office — insinuating thereby, that he frequented that office for personal motives. Now, he begged most distinctly to state that such was not the case, and further then [sic] that, he had not been in the Crown Land Office a dozen times since the present head of that department had taken charge of that department. He was charged with illiberalism, and many other things which were as equally untrue. He (Mr. Rhodes) has stated that the Irish Roman Catholics were illiberal; but he would ask that gentleman to review his own conduct, and tell the House how many liberal measures he has voted for since he came to Parliament. It did not become that gentleman to speak of illiberalism. As a specimen of the liberal views entertained by the member for Megantic, he would mention that when in Quebec he had voted for representation by population, and when he came up here he swallowed his own vote, and voted against representation by population. That gentleman's character was exactly similar to that given of a nobleman by a celebrated poet:

"Stiff in opinion — always in the wrong,

Was every thing by starts — but nothing long."

He would go further, and state that the member for Megantic once asked him (Mr. [O']Farrell) to enter into an alliance, offensive and defensive, together.²⁹⁵

CAPT. RHODES. — It is untrue.²⁹⁶

MR. O'FARRELL. — It is not untrue. He could name the time and place where the conversation took place. Mr. McKerlie was present at the time that the member for Megantic made the proposition, and was to be included in the alliance. He (Mr. O'F.) could tell tales of the manœuvres of the member for Megantic that would astonish the house. (Cries of "no, no.") Before sitting down he would allude to a requisition got up by [the] gentleman for an ice bridge in Megantic. It was to be a famous ice bridge — built of straw and salt. (Laughter.) Perhaps the hon. member would prefer the baby-kissing to this. The hon. member has stated that at the next election he intends to set up for the County of Quebec. No doubt he has his own reasons for not running for Megantic again. The last time, however, that he ran for the County of Quebec, he did not get a single vote in the parish which he canvassed. After all, he (Mr. O'F.) was inclined to think that the member for Megantic must have been jesting when he made such a wanton charge upon that section of people to which he (Mr. O'Farrell) had the honor to belong.²⁹⁷

MR. CONGER rose to speak²⁹⁸ —

Loud calls for the adjournment from the ministerial side of the House²⁹⁹.

DR. MASSON moved an adjournment.³⁰⁰

MR. BROWN hoped that the House would not adjourn until the vote was taken. Several members came to the House with the view of voting to-night, and could not, without inconvenience wait another day in town.³⁰¹ The government were desirous of pressing ... [the adjournment], because they knew the opposition would lose two votes, if the vote was not taken to-night.³⁰² It was only twelve o'clock, and there was plenty of time for hon. gentlemen to say what they had to say. He did not wish to stop the discussion.³⁰³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE said it was quite usual, after the member for Lambton had made a speech for two hours and a half, as he had done to-night, to wish the vote to be taken.³⁰⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH ... spoke in favour of the adjournment³⁰⁵.

MR. RANKIN rose to speak, but was cried down.³⁰⁶

MR. BELLINGHAM hoped that as it was so late the House would adjourn, thereby giving an opportunity to those who had not spoken yet to do so, without those marks of disapprobation which were sure to greet a speaker at the present late hour.³⁰⁷

MR. RANKIN desired the vote to be taken at once, as ... no new argument could be advanced by either side now.³⁰⁸

MR. POWELL reminded the House that Mr. Rankin had spoken two hours already on the subject, and he did not see the reason why other members would not be permitted to do the same. No doubt, if that gentleman spoke for as many more hours, he could not adduce any new arguments.³⁰⁹

The motion for the adjournment was then put from the chair, and carried.³¹⁰

(551) | Then, on motion of Mr. *Masson*, seconded by Mr. *Turcotte*,
The House adjourned.³¹¹

Footnotes

1. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856, reports that this Bill "was reported from the Legislative Council, and read a first and second time" immediately preceding the 6 o'clock adjournment.
2. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856. *Globe*, 30 May 1856, reports that "after the usual routine business, the debate on the motion of want of confidence was resumed by a personal explanation between Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Alleyn, with reference to some remarks of the former delivered yesterday." According to the account in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856, this occurred before the routine business was proceeded with.
3. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
6. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
7. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
8. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
11. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
12. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
13. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
14. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
15. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
16. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
18. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
19. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
20. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.

22. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
23. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
24. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
25. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
26. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
27. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
28. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
30. *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 31 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856, reports this statement in the following manner: "If I cannot appeal to the conservatives in this House successfully, I have no doubt the conservatives out of the House will give me their support."
31. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
32. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
33. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
34. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
35. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
36. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
37. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
38. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856.
39. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
40. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
41. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
42. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
43. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
44. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
45. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
46. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
47. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
48. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
49. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
50. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
51. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
52. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
53. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
54. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
55. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
56. *Globe*, 30 May 1856. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856, has a very similar account, except that it does not report any reference to Mr. Cameron. It is as follows: "What was the answer he [Mr. Macdonald] made? Just what it had always since been — that Sir Allan was his leader, and as long as he led he (Mr. McDonald) would follow. The hon. and learned member remarked then, 'I am glad to hear you say that, it is just what I expected of you;' he had faithfully acted to that pledge since."
57. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
58. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
59. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
60. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
61. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
62. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
63. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
64. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
66. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
67. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
69. *Globe*, 30 May 1856. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856, concurs with this account, whereas *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856, reports that Mr. Macdonald said: "By Mr. Spence's advice, a letter enclosing this communication was forwarded to Sir Allan."

70. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
74. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
75. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
76. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
77. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
78. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
79. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
80. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
81. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
82. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
83. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
85. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
86. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
87. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
91. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
92. *Ibid.*
93. *Ibid.*
94. *Ibid.*
95. *Ibid.*
96. *Ibid.*
97. *Ibid.*
98. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
99. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
100. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
101. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Ibid.*
104. *Ibid.*
105. *Ibid.*
106. *Ibid.*
107. *Ibid.*
108. *Ibid.*
109. *Globe*, 30 May 1856. According to *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856, Sir A. MacNab stated "that he had a conversation with the Governor General about the resignation, previous to the Council from which he had sent the letter he had spoken of, requiring the presence of his Excellency."
110. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
111. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
112. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
113. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
114. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
115. *Ibid.*
116. *Ibid.*
117. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
118. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
119. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
120. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
121. *Ibid.*
122. *Ibid.*
123. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.

124. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Ibid.*
127. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
128. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
129. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
130. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
131. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*
134. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
135. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
136. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
137. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
138. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
139. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
140. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
141. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
142. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
143. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
144. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
145. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856. This newspaper also reports that immediately before the recess, "the bill to enable the Montreal Water Works Company, to borrow £50,000 was reported from the Legislative Council, and read a first and second time." The *Journals* reference to these proceedings is found on page (551) 2274.
146. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
147. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
148. *Ibid.*
149. *Ibid.*
150. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
151. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
152. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
153. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
155. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
156. *Ibid.*
157. *Ibid.*
158. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
159. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
160. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
161. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
162. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
163. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
164. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
165. *Ibid.*
166. *Ibid.*
167. *Ibid.*
168. *Ibid.*
169. *Ibid.*
170. *Ibid.*
171. *Ibid.*
172. *Ibid.*
173. *Ibid.*
174. *Ibid.*
175. *Ibid.*
176. *Ibid.*
177. *Ibid.*

178. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
179. *Ibid.*
180. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
181. *Ibid.*
182. *Ibid.*
183. *Ibid.*
184. *Ibid.*
185. *Ibid.*
186. *Ibid.*
187. *Ibid.*
188. *Ibid.*
189. *Ibid.*
190. *Ibid.*
191. *Ibid.*
192. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
193. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
194. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
195. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
196. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
197. *Ibid.*
198. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
199. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
200. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
201. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
202. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
203. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
204. *Ibid.*
205. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
206. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
207. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
208. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
209. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
210. *Ibid.*
211. *Ibid.*
212. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
213. *Ibid.*
214. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
215. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
216. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
217. *Globe*, 31 May 1856. *Globe*, 30 May 1856, and *Western Planet*, 5 June 1856, report commentaries regarding the reading of this letter in the House and the explanations which were given thereafter by Mr. J.A. Macdonald.
218. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
219. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
220. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
221. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
222. *Ibid.*
223. *Ibid.*
224. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
225. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
226. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
227. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
228. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
229. *Globe*, 31 May 1856. In its commentary, *Globe*, 30 May 1856, reports that after he had finished speaking, Mr. J.A. Macdonald "crossed the House and spoke to Dr. Clarke, and immediately after, returning to his place, said that that member was charged with a message from Dr. Herrick on the subject." This short statement along with Dr. Clarke's explanations are found on page 2296.

230. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
231. *Ibid.*
232. *Ibid.*
233. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
234. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
235. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
236. *Ibid.*
237. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
238. *Ibid.*
239. *Ibid.*
240. *Montreal Gazette*, 31 May 1856.
241. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
242. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
243. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
244. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
245. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
246. *Ibid.*
247. *Ibid.*
248. *Ibid.*
249. *Ibid.*
250. *Ibid.*
251. *Ibid.*
252. *Ibid.*
253. *Ibid.*
254. *Ibid.*
255. *Ibid.*
256. *Ibid.*
257. *Ibid.*
258. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
259. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
260. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
261. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
262. *Ibid.*
263. *Ibid.*
264. *Ibid.*
265. *Ibid.*
266. *Ibid.*
267. *Ibid.*
268. *Ibid.*
269. *Ibid.*
270. *Ibid.*
271. *Ibid.*
272. *Ibid.*
273. *Ibid.*
274. *Ibid.*
275. *Ibid.*
276. *Ibid.*
277. *Ibid.*
278. *Ibid.*
279. *Ibid.*
280. *Ibid.*
281. *Ibid.*
282. *Ibid.*
283. *Ibid.*
284. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
285. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.

286. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
287. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
288. *Ibid.*
289. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
290. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
291. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
292. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
293. *Ibid.*
294. *Ibid.*
295. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
296. *Ibid.*
297. *Ibid.*
298. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856. *Globe*, 31 May 1856, reports that this gentleman rose to speak "at twelve o'clock".
299. *Globe*, 30 May 1856. This information is taken from a commentary.
300. *Globe*, 31 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856, differs and reports the motion was made by Mr. Turcotte. The *Journals*, however, report that the motion was moved by Dr. Masson and seconded by Mr. Turcotte.
301. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
302. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
303. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
304. *Ibid.*
305. *Globe*, 30 May 1856.
306. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
307. *Ibid.*
308. *Ibid.*
309. *Ibid.*
310. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 30 May 1856, reports a commentary on this day's debate.
311. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856, reports that the House adjourned "at a quarter past twelve o'clock."

FRIDAY, 30 MAY 1856

(551)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Fournier*, — The Petition of *O.E. Casgrain* and others, of the County of *L'Islet*.

By the Honorable Mr. *Cayley*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Wawanosh*; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Saugeen*; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *McKillop*.

(552)

By Mr. *Mackenzie*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Tuckersmith*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of the Municipal Council of the County of *Lincoln*; praying that the Bill now before the House to authorize the Municipal Council of the County of *Lincoln* to select a new site for a County Town and for other purposes, may become Law.

Of the Honorable *M.P. De Sales Laterrière* and others, of the Parish of *Les Eboulemens*; praying that in uniting the County of *Saguenay* to the County of *Charlevoix* for Judicial purposes, the chief place may be continued at *Les Eboulemens*.

Of *David Williams* and others, of the Township of *Arthur*; praying that representation may be based upon population.

Of the Municipality of the Township of the Gore of *Toronto*; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*,

Ordered, That the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to amend the Act to alter and amend the Act regulating the practice of the County Courts of *Upper Canada*, and to extend the jurisdiction thereof," be now read for the first time.

The Bill was accordingly read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.

Ordered, That the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to enable the Churchwardens of *St. George's Church* in the Town of *St. Catharines*, to sell and convey four acres of land originally purchased 'as a site for a parsonage,' and for other purposes," be read the third time on Monday next.

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, pursuant to Addresses to His Excellency the Governor General, — Return in part to an Address from the Legislative Assembly of the 12th instant, for names and information relative to Returning Officers for the General Election of 1854.

By Command.

Geo. Et. Cartier,
Secretary.

Secretary's Office,
Toronto, 24th May, 1856.

No. 154.

Inspector General's Office,
Toronto, 19th May, 1856.

Sir, — In compliance with the Address of the Legislative Assembly of 12th instant, I do myself the honor to enclose a Return of the names of the Returning Officers for the General Election of 1854, who made to the Government the Returns required by the 66th Section of the 12 *Vic.* cap. 27, and who annexed thereto all the necessary Vouchers.

2nd. Of the Returning Officers for the General Election, who made to the Government Returns without annexing thereto all the necessary Vouchers.

3rd. Those Returning Officers who did not make such Returns.

This Return only embraces the names of the Returning Officers in *Upper Canada*; the Accounts of those in *Lower Canada* having been transmitted to the Commissioners of Enquiry into them, the information required in their case could not be given.

(553)

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

Honorable G.E. Cartier,
Provincial Secretary.

William Dickinson,
Actg. D.I.G.

Return shewing the names of the Returning Officers for the General Election of 1854, who made to the Government the Returns required by the 66th Section of 12 Vic. cap. 27, and who annexed thereto all the necessary vouchers; of the Returning Officers for the said General Election who made to the Government Returns without annexing thereto all the necessary vouchers; and of those Returning Officers who did not make such Returns: —

Names of Returning Officers who made Returns with all the necessary vouchers annexed thereto: —

Simon Fraser, Carleton; James Durand, Kingston; Adam Hope, London, Canada West.

Names of Returning Officers who made Returns without annexing thereto all the necessary vouchers: —

A. Sherwood, North Riding, Leeds and Grenville; H. Ruttan, East Riding, Northumberland; E.C. Thomas, North Riding, Wentworth; Jno. Patton, South Riding, Grenville; H. Burwell, West Riding, Middlesex; Geo. T. Grange, North Riding, Wellington; Jas. Thompson, North Riding, Lanark; Geo. Lount, South Riding, Simcoe; R. Moderwell, Perth; Jno. McKay, West Riding, Elgin; Jas. McDonald, Prince Edward; Jas. Keays, Russell; Jas. Flintoft, Lambton; G.C. Wood, Cornwall; J.W.D. Moodie, North Riding, Hastings; D. D'Everardo, Welland; B.W. Smith, Simcoe; Thos. Racey, Halton; Thos. Scott, West Riding, Northumberland; D.E. McIntyre, Stormont; G.H. Park, Hamilton; Jno. Smith, East Riding, Brant; David Reesor, East Riding, York; W.H. Ponton, South Riding, Hastings; Jas. Ingersoll, South Riding, Oxford; Colin Munro, East Riding, Elgin; B.W. Peterson, Wellington; E.S. Adams, Lincoln; L.W. Mercer, Niagara; C.P. Treadwell, Prescott; W.S. Conger, Peterborough; R. Edmonson, Brockville; Jas. Morris, Renfrew; W.B. Jarvis, North Riding, York; Isaac Smith, Bytown; Chas. Rubidge, Victoria; David Jones, South Riding, Leeds; D.A. McDonald, Glengarry; Jno. Mercer, Kent; B.F. Perry, West Riding, Durham; Jas. Bell, South Riding, Lanark; T.S. Shenston, West Riding, Brant; A. McDonald, Dundas; G.F. Ward, East Riding, Durham; Richard Martin, Haldimand; J.H. Perry, Ontario; Jas. Carroll, North Riding, Oxford; D.S. Shoemaker, South Riding, Waterloo; G.S. Clapp, Lenox and Addington; H.V.A. Rapelje, County of Norfolk; S. Brega, Peel; G.S. Reynolds, North Riding, Ontario; Geo. Davidson, North Riding, Waterloo; Jas. Hamilton, East Riding, Middlesex; Geo. Snider, Grey; Jno. Bell, Toronto; T.A. Corbett, Frontenac; Philip Spawn, South Riding, Wentworth; Jno. McDonald, Huron and Bruce; W.A. Baldwin, West Riding, York.

Name[s] of Returning Officers who did not make such Return: —

W.D. Baby, Essex.

This Statement only embraces the Names of the Returning Officers in *Upper Canada*, the Accounts of the Returning Officers in *Lower Canada* having been transmitted to the Commissioners of Enquiry into them, no further information can be given on this subject.

(554)

William Dickinson,

Inspector General's Office,
Toronto, 17th May, 1856.

Actg. D.I. Gen.

Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly of the 28th ultimo, for the Names of all Public Officers to whom an advance for two months' salary was made, on the occasion of the removal from *Quebec* to *Toronto*, and the amount of the advance.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 58.)

Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly of the 28th March, 1856, for copies of the Plans connected with the Surveys for the *St. Lawrence* and *Champlain* Canal, and improvement of the *St. Lawrence* Rapids.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 13.)

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier* also laid before the House, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, — Returns of the Clerks of the Councils in *Upper Canada*, under 16 *Vic. cap.* 163, sec. 2.

For the said Returns, see Appendix (No. 59.)

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.¹

The House then resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, on Monday last, proposed to be made to the Question, That the Orders of the day be now read; and which Amendment was, That all the words after “That” to the end of the Question be left out, and the words “an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing the regret of this House that the recent changes in the Administration are not such as to secure to the Constitutional Advisers of His Excellency the confidence of this House and of the Country” inserted instead thereof;

MR. CONGER ... said he deeply regretted that the time of that House had been, day after day taken up, and the treasure of the country squandered by thousands of pounds in the discussion of a matter of such trifling importance as that now before the House. For weeks they had been engaged in the discussion of matters of very little interest to the country, and which could not result in any practical good. If any great principle was at stake — or any important measure were pending, he could readily excuse this proceeding; but it appeared to him to be nothing more than a scramble for office. Now, he would deprecate all such factious opposition. Hon. gentlemen should look more to the measures than the men. He was not disposed, at this stage of the proceedings, after the House had been in session some three months and a half, to throw away the entire business of the country, and allow hon. gentlemen to return to their homes without accomplishing something — without doing, at least some practical good. He would, therefore, feel justified in taking the position of voting against the motion before the House², although he did not consider that he could be looked upon generally as being a very warm supporter of the Administration³. He had entered the House as an independent member, as far as regarded his support of the Ministry; and he would ever maintain that course, supporting them when right and voting against them when they were wrong.⁴ (Hear, hear.)⁵ But he did not see how any hon. gentleman could vote for a motion which would, if carried, have the effect of ousting those hon. gentlemen, before their abilities had been tested.⁶ (Oh! oh!)⁷ Every man was entitled to be heard before he was condemned. What principles had those hon. gentlemen, now so eagerly seeking to overthrow the Administration. Their only principles seemed to be those of opposition to everything coming from that side of the House. Now, he was not disposed to allow hon. members on the opposition benches connected with railway companies, who were ready to squeeze the life blood out of the country for the benefit of their companies, to usurp the Treasury benches, and thereby carry out their schemes of aggrandizement.⁸ Many hon. gentlemen opposite had no right certainly to find fault with the position taken by those on the ministerial side, they themselves having enunciated Conservative doctrines formerly, and among those gentlemen conspicuously stood forth the members for London, Glengary and South Wentworth.⁹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD repudiated the accusation.¹⁰

MR. FOLEY. — Did the hon. member mean to convey the idea that he (Mr. Foley) ever possessed the least Conservative principles.¹¹

MR. CONGER did not mean to say so, but the hon. gentleman had made an attempt to injure the character of a gentleman who was about to come into this house¹², by torturing a speech, delivered by him some time since.¹³

MR. HOLTON. — For where?¹⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — Don't be too inquisitive. For Montreal.¹⁵

MR. HOLTON. — The Hon. Mr. Cartier is going to resign in his favour. (Laughter.)¹⁶

MR. CONGER continued. — The attempt made by the hon. member for South Waterloo against Mr. Vankoughnet, would recoil on his own head.¹⁷ He had no doubt the incorrect reading of that speech was done in order to deceive the Lower Canadian members of that House, but he was very happy to say that it had a diametrically opposite effect.¹⁸

MR. FOLEY. — Will the hon. member state where I read the speech incorrectly?¹⁹

MR. CONGER. — That has been shown already by my hon. friend the Attorney General. The hon. gentleman then went on to state that the opinions he then professed, were those he had held for the last twenty-five years, and would still continue to hold.²⁰ [He] would take that course which he thought best for the country. He would like to say a few words to his reform friends on his side of the house.²¹

Several Members. — Who are they? (Laughter.)²²

MR. CONGER hoped that they would not now cross over to the other side of the house and take part with the member for South York and other members with him, whose opinions he thought would be most injurious to the country. On the contrary, he thought that every effort should be made to maintain the Union between the two Provinces.²³

MR. PATRICK said that the address of the hon. member for Peterboro' to his brother Reformers was not a little amusing. All those hon. gentlemen save one, had been compelled to oppose that Administration; and that hon. gentleman, he supposed, considered that he could not do so decently — his brother being a member of the Cabinet.²⁴ With regard to the recent changes, he did not think it was the intention of the Independence of Parliament Act, to allow a ministry to go out, change some of their officers, and then all to come in calling themselves a new ministry.²⁵ If the present administration were progressive — it certainly must be a retrogressing progressiveness. (Laughter.) He would like to know how the Attorney General West reconciled it to his conscience to assume the leadership²⁶ of a new moderate — non descript progressive party, when he had been only known to the country as a warm and active partizan of the ultra Tory party, and what claim had the Postmaster General to join in such a party when he had taken office on thorough reform principles.²⁷ By way of supporting that administration, they were about to introduce into it a young Canadian Dutchman, in place of an old Canadian Scotchman. (Laughter.) But the vote that evening, would, he felt confident, show them that such a Government would not be tolerated by the House or the country.²⁸

MR. STEVENSON said that it was very strange that men should change their opinions so suddenly. The gentleman who had just spoken, had been for the early part of this session and during the whole of the last, a staunch supporter of the Government.²⁹

MR. PATRICK. — No.³⁰

MR. STEVENSON. — The hon. member had supported them more or less up to a certain day this session, that is, if we can judge of a man's opinions by his votes; but it would hardly be fair to expect a

man to be consistent for more than three months.³¹ [Mr. Patrick's] feelings seemed to have been of the growth of Jonah's gourd.³² He (Mr. S.) thought the Government were as much worthy of support now as they were then. As regarded Representation by Population, he thought that already existed, as nearly as circumstances would permit. On the other side of the lake, where they had adopted Representation by Population to the fullest extent, they did not have a change in the Ridings oftener than 10 or 15 years. And Representation having been fixed here three years ago, there was no necessity for interfering with it till after the next census should be taken, four or five years hence. At the present time, the question was only agitated for the purpose of deluding the people. But he did not think the people of Canada would be led away by any such cry. He had too good an opinion of the electors of Upper Canada, to believe that any member would ever lose his seat for pursuing a straightforward and manly course.³³ He would vote against the motion.³⁴

MR. SOMERVILLE wished to explain briefly the reasons for the vote he intended to give. He was not a great admirer of Coalition Governments, but it must be admitted that they were sometimes necessary, and it was only when there was some one strong party, united on all the great questions of the day, and powerful enough of itself to carry on the Administration of the affairs of the country, that the necessity for a Coalition Government did not exist. When the last Administration was formed, he considered that such a necessity at that time existed, and he determined to give that Administration an independent and generous support, voting for all their measures when he could do so conscientiously. It was true that in a number of instances he had felt it to be his duty to vote against that Administration, but he could assure the House that he looked back with a great deal of satisfaction on the general support he had given them. The measures introduced and passed by the late Administration were such, he thought, that that Administration would not soon be forgotten. He believed it would long be remembered by the country.³⁵

Ironical cries of "Hear, hear," by the Opposition.³⁶

[MR. SOMERVILLE] alluded particularly to their settlement of the Clergy Reserves and Seigniorial Tenure questions. These two great questions had agitated the country for many, many years; and he considered that the Government, for having settled those questions, and put an end to all the strifes and heartburnings they had excited, deserved credit at the hands of the country. And he was sure that, years hence, they would be considered as having conferred a greater benefit by those measures on the country, than any preceding Administration in this Province. (Ironical cries of Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen might cry Hear, hear, and there were no doubt differences of opinion in regard to the mode in which those questions should have been settled; but he thought every hon. gentleman would admit that the getting rid of those heartburnings and strifes, to which he had alluded, was a very great matter — although, probably, some hon. members might have preferred to keep those questions before the country, that they might more easily ride themselves into power. It was not his intention to express any opinion on the reasons given for the withdrawal of the gallant knight and the late Attorney General East from the Cabinet. But he attached no small importance, and he was sure all those members who resided in country districts would also attach much importance, to the appointment of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Terrill). With every respect for the abilities and high legislative talents of the late Attorney General East — and although he regretted, with many other members, that that hon. gentleman should have left the Government — yet, seeing that they had now in the Government a gentleman resident in the Eastern Townships, brought up in the Townships, and fully understanding the working of our municipal, educational, and agricultural institutions, he thought that such an appointment was a very great advantage. The late Atty. Gen. East carried through last session an Act to reform our municipal institutions, and he was satisfied that almost every member of the house, acquainted with the workings of those institutions, would agree with him that, if the hon. gentleman had resided in the country, and had some practical experience in the matter, that law in its present shape would never have appeared in the statute book. (Hear, hear.) But he anticipated with a good deal of certainty that his hon. friend, the new Provincial Secretary, from

his practical experience of the requirements of the country, would be able to devise some useful measures for the improvement of our municipal, educational and agricultural institutions. It was not because the hon. gentleman happened to be a personal friend of his own, or because he was of the same religious persuasion, that he was glad he had got into the government, but because he considered him peculiarly qualified for the office to which his Excellency has thought fit to call him. In regard to the appointment of Mr. Vankoughnet, as a general principle, he would say that it had been better if some one possessed of parliamentary experience had been selected. Still, if the hon. gentleman had the talents he was said to possess, he hoped his appointment would turn out to the advantage of the country. On the whole, he was prepared to give the new government a fair trial, and intended to give them the same support as he had given to the last.³⁷

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER, in reply to certain remarks by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Galt), denied having sought to displace the late Attorney General East; on the contrary, he had used every effort to induce him to remain in a position which he had filled with so much credit to himself and utility to the country.³⁸ [He] repudiated the statement that he ever called himself the "bull dog of the Administration" as had been asserted by the hon. member for Sherbrooke. What he had stated on the occasion was, that he was something like a bull-dog — never attacking, but when attacked, ready and willing to defend himself. Again, as to the charge of being tenacious, he would state that such was not the fact. Five years ago, he had been offered the high office of Solicitor General, but had declined that office; and again, in 1851, he was offered the post of Commissioner of Public Works, but declined it, using all his influence to obtain it for either of the hon. members for Montreal, Mr. Young, or Mr. Holton.³⁹ When Mr. Young went to his election in Montreal, he [Mr. Cartier] used every exertion to secure that gentleman's election, knowing that if Mr. Young retired from office, his party would have pressed him to accept.⁴⁰ Again, the following year he was offered the same post, but still declined its acceptance, on principle. Now, had he been possessed of the grasping qualities assigned to him, surely he would have seized on such splendid offers with avidity. With reference to the statements of the hon. member for Wolf[e], he (Mr. Cartier) was free to state that his office was an onerous one and his talents not at all equal to those of the late highly endowed incumbent of that office. The hon. gentleman spoke at great length, vindicating his own talents and course of conduct.⁴¹ He did not desire to see the retirement of the late Attorney General East from the Cabinet; but on the contrary regretted it sincerely. The measures introduced and originated by the late Government would be faithfully carried out; and with respect to the codification of the laws of Lower Canada, he thought the present was a very happy time for carrying it into effect; and he knew of no person better adapted to act as codificator than the late Attorney General East. A good deal of good had been done by the introduction of the measure of the ex-Attorney General East, to equalize justice in Lower Canada.⁴² [Mr. Cartier then] referred to the Act under which notaries act in Lower Canada, and said that the present law being defective should be changed. Notaries ought to receive their commission to act in certain jurisdictions. He had intended to have brought in such a measure, but was prevented by the breaking up of the Parliament. The hon. gentleman concluded by alluding to the very extraordinary speech made by the hon. member for Lambton last night. He hoped that the people of Lower Canada would bear it in mind. In that speech the member for Lambton wanted to make it appear to the people of Lower Canada the great success that he had among Upper Canadians. His whole speech was in favor of Upper Canada prejudices — according to his notion — against Lower Canada. The member for Lambton has stated that no legislation ought to take place in the country before the separate school question and representation by population be finally settled. He has in fact put it to the House and the country that this House ought to do nothing but agitate.⁴³

MR. BROWN. — No, no.⁴⁴

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — The hon. member says no. But he maintained that he [Mr. Brown] was too fond of throwing the brand of discord into the ranks of Lower Canadians.⁴⁵ They would no doubt

before long have an opportunity of discussing those parts of ... [Mr. Brown's speech] relating to the extinction of Separate Schools. The Catholics of Lower Canada would never consent to join with the hon. member for Lambton in any injustice to the Protestants of Lower Canada⁴⁶, to satisfy the fanatical spirit of the hon. member for Lambton.⁴⁷ (Hear, hear.)⁴⁸

MR. CHABOT (in French) referred to the beneficial measures which had been introduced by the ex-Attorney General East, and spoke in support of the Administration.⁴⁹

MR. MACKENZIE deprecated the inveterate talking which prolonged this discussion fifteen day[s]. The proceedings of the House were more like those which took place at the Tower of Babel than anything else — an eternal babble of conflicting tongues. If the House was now ready to come to a vote, he was willing to sit down at once and record his vote against ministers; for nobody looking at them could possibly do anything else. If the Governor General were to act a wise part — seeing that they had hitherto done nothing but evil — he would dismiss them at once. Who was the head of the present administration, Col. Tache? He was one of the most ultra Rouges in the Province. (Loud laughter.)⁵⁰ He was no conservative. It was one of the most droll ideas he ever heard of, that he should be allied to an ultra Orangeman like Mr. Vankoughnet. This Colonel Tache, who was now called a Conservative, avowed in the *Vindicator* newspaper the most ultra Rouge doctrine, and called Mr. Papineau the greatest patriot that ever was.⁵¹ As a proof of that honorable gentleman's principles, he would take the liberty of dipping a little into history; and in this instance he would refer to the number of the Montreal *Vindicator*, for July the 4th, 1837. In that paper he found an account of an anti-coercion meeting of the Counties of L'Islet and Bellechasse, which took place on the 26th of the previous month; and among the names of those present at that meeting, he found that of E.P. Tache, Esq., (the present premier). At that meeting that hon. gentleman moved the following resolution; — "Resolved, That the people of this Province cannot look upon the resolution of ministers and of Parliament, and the pretended laws to be based thereon, otherwise than as a breach of the social contract which exists between the mother country and the Province, by depriving the latter of all guarantee for liberty and good government, replacing the same, by one of force, under the tyrannical pretext of necessity, of which they were not the judges, and that such an order of things can continue only so long as the people whom it is determined to crush cannot overthrow it." There is the rouge worthy for you, who is now to be Administrator in Chief of the destinies of this great Province. (Hear, hear.) But he would also like to say a few words respecting one of that hon. gentleman's present colleague[s], the Provincial Secretary [Mr. Cartier]. That hon. gentleman was not in 1837 the important functionary he is now. At that time, he was merely a petty agitator, endeavoring to get into power, and his advice to the people was — Do not pay one dollar of taxes — you can smuggle in the articles⁵² from the States,⁵³ and needn't pay this hateful impost; and not content with this, he signed his name to a document, binding himself to use every exertion to put down the Government. And why? Simply, because it expended money without the consent of the people. What a pity the hon. gentleman had so sadly degenerated in principle. Why does he not act on that advice now? If the doctrine was right then, surely, it was right now. But no; the hon. member could not think of allowing his principles to stand in the way of his preferment; and he now forms part of a Government, whose policy is, in that respect, identical. They spend far more of the people's money without their consent than our rulers in 1837 did.⁵⁴ He then attacked Sir Allan MacNab for endeavouring to drive Lord Elgin out of the country in 1849, and then clinging to him for the sake of office. He despised his political character, whether he voted in opposition, or continued to support the Government.⁵⁵

Six o'clock having arrived, the House adjourned.⁵⁶

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the chair at five minutes to eight.⁵⁷

MR. MACKENZIE resumed. In reply to the present Attorney General East, that he (Mr. Mackenzie) would lose his seat in Haldimand, he would say that it was an unfair threat. When the people had a good and a costly article, why bid them throw it away for that which is inferior? When a reward of £500 was offered for that hon. gentleman's head — he being then a rebel — they offered £1,000 for his (Mr. Mackenzie's). (Laughter.)⁵⁸ But since then, the hon. gentleman had wormed his way up from being one of the £500 men, to being Attorney General East.⁵⁹ The hon. gentleman then commented on the beautiful specimens of a Finance Minister and Receiver General they were now blessed with, and expressed the pleasure he felt in knowing that the latter hon. gentleman was going to be opposed in his election by his (Mr. Mackenzie's) old and valued public servant, Mr. Woodruffe, of Niagara. And to make the matters worse, the Government was to be headed by a Rouge, and allied with an ultra tory. The only thing he ever saw like it, was when their jesuit friend (Cauchon) stepped out of his way to pick up an orangeman! (Laughter.) Aye, the Grand Master of that body, and a deputy master, or something of that sort, named Morgan Hamilton, and sent them up west to form Orange Lodges, by way of looking after the Crown Lands! (Laughter.) Surely the millen[n]ium was come — the lion was lying down with the lamb — and Conservatives, Rouges, and Liberals, were to act in harmony with each other. There were still some doubts, however, as to this harmony.... Among the present Cabinet Ministers, he had neglected to mention his Presbyterian friend from Kingston; for he believed that member (Macdonald) styled himself a Presbyterian among his Kingston constituents, (Laughter,)⁶⁰ although he was never aware that he had much religion of any kind. Lord Byron said — "I am myself a moderate Presbyterian." The remark, he thought, might have been made more appropriately of his hon. friend opposite. For if the Attorney General was a Presbyterian, he was a very moderate one. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman, when in opposition, denounced the scheme for giving \$1,800,000 to buy freeholds for Lower Canadian farmers, at the expense of Upper Canada; but when he got into office, with £800 a year, which he very soon converted into £1500, he put his principles into his pocket, and then disgraced his seat by⁶¹ [abusing] the member for Lambton in language which was a disgrace⁶² to any Christian community. And the language of the Solicitor General was still more infamous.⁶³

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — What did I say?⁶⁴

MR. MACKENZIE. — My tongue, bad as it is, is not bad enough to repeat the words you used. I would not defile my mouth with⁶⁵ such language. It went to a committee.⁶⁶

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — Try.⁶⁷

MR. MACKENZIE. — Let the hon. Attorney General East answer the question he (Mr. Mackenzie) put to him. Now that the Government, as in olden time, spent the public money without the consent of the public, were they to smuggle in their goods, as that functionary had heretofore advised them? He (Mr. Mackenzie) was now occupying the reform ground he had taken 33 years ago, and he would ever be found an earnest and persistent advocate of the people's rights.⁶⁸ The hon. member then went on to refer to Grand Trunk matters, and to the position of the new Administration. He could not conceive that, if they were defeated by an Upper Canada majority, and they said they were greatly shaken by a majority of 5 or 6 votes from Upper Canada the other night — then, how can they expect to carry on the Government with an Upper Canada majority against them of 12, as they will have to-night.⁶⁹ And as for the number of the new opponents to this precious Ministry, that was something to be wondered at. Among them were the honorable member for Megantic, that very mild personage, the member for Wolfe, and the member for South York, who had been paying a series of most extraordinary compliments to the ex-inspector general [and] member for Simcoe [Mr. Robinson], of Family Compact notoriety. (Laughter.) The whole affair was a farce. He believed every word of what they said of each other, however. When a certain class fall out, it is said that honest men get their own; and so in this case. (Hear, hear.) Were a dissolution to take place to-morrow, he firmly believed those honorable gentlemen opposite would be

universally scouted by the people of Upper Canada. The Provincial Secretary has said that we must not have representation by population in Upper Canada, which would set Upper Canada in its true position, as the most popular part of the country. Will the member for Guelph (Dr. Clarke) swallow this pill also? He (Mr. McKenzie) understood that the Governor General was strongly against the double majority system. Yet if this doctrine was set aside, the country would be the lower, with the power in the Governor to place as few or as many Upper Canadians as he pleased in the Council, and to go on with Lower Canada majorities regulating exclusively for Upper Canada, de[p]rived [of] its fair share of representation, where would the chest be on Downing Street? Was not the patronage immense? The Postmaster General, seeing that the auction was going the wrong way, said that he must resign. He did so, and immediately took office again. Had that gentleman come back again, or had he changed his principles? He (Mr. McKenzie) thought that the House should come to the vote to-night; and if the Government will not come to the vote to-night, they will show that they are afraid.⁷⁰ They say that they are not a Coalition, but a party that has nothing to do with the Coalition.⁷¹ Col. Tache, in making his ministerial explanation, said that Mr. Macdonald was working on a new principle, and that his party was to be composed of moderate Reformers and progressive Conservatives.⁷² Why, they are the very same men! It is true that Shakespeare has said, that a rose, by any other name, smells as sweet, — but they smelt to-day just as they did before, and their smell was rather offensive to him. It would be far more pleasant to his olfactory nerves, if they were a little further off. They call themselves the progressive party, but their progress is like that of the crab.⁷³ They make one step forward and two backward.⁷⁴ To turn (said Mr. M.) to the hon. Attorney General West. In former times he too had contended for retrenchment, and for remedying other abuses, but since he came into power, what economy, what remedial measure has he instituted? Not one; on the contrary, he has fostered extravagance and perpetuated abuse. The same also might be said of many others of his present colleagues.⁷⁵ Then Mr. Vankoughnet was named as President of the Council. He (Mr. McK.) would ask had that gentleman any seat in the House, or does he represent any body of the people of the country, that he should be named for that office? The hon. gentleman here adverted to the former sentiments of Col. Tache, his resolutions for stopping the supplies, his support of the celebrated 92 resolutions, and stated that Sir Francis Head had stated that the man that uttered those sentiments ought to be shot.⁷⁶ The Kingston *Argus*, in which is President Vankoughnet's speech depreciating the French Canadians, ought to be re-printed for circulation amongst the Lower Canada members of this house. But besides setting down their women as fit only for factory girls (laughter), and their men as no better, this new President of the Council has declared against the union of the Canadas, and characterised it as the result of corruption and bribery. How can the Rouge Premier (Mr. Tache) act with this gentleman? Such sentiments as he had here referred to ought to be circulated throughout the country as the present sentiments of the hon. Inspector General, the hon. Postmaster General and his mosaic colleagues.⁷⁷ The hon. gentleman then alluded to the appointment of Mr. Terrill as Secretary of the Province, and stated that it was beyond his (Mr. McK.'s) conception how that gentleman could fill such an office.⁷⁸ Who is he? Where was he found? Probably a fifth-rate lawyer of some obscure village, who could not make more than 15s a day, and charge that.⁷⁹ In 1849, Mr. Terrill was an annexationist and yet Col. Tache had stated [in] the other House that he could not find a man more suited for the office of Provincial Secretary than Mr. Terrill — an annexationist forsooth!⁸⁰ [He] would therefore make a very congenial colleague for the Rouge premier. What company. The hon. and gallant knight has shown his foresight in getting out [of] it. But he likewise will go before the country on the Opposition ticket, and come back again to the house only to join another Coalition, as he formerly did, and thus put all our principles to a violent death. He had seen men inside and outside this house advocate liberal, even to republican, principles, and when once in office they wheel about and oppose everything they have hitherto urged. There were plenty of examples on the ministerial side, and the Rev. Dr. Ryerson is a prominent example outside.⁸¹ The hon. gentleman then referred to the Legislative Council Bill, and denounced that section which demanded that the candidate for that House should be possessed of £2,000 worth of real estate. Was Burns? — he asked. Was John Wesley? Was Roebuck, or were many of the brightest men that ever

adorned the British Senate, possessors of £200[0] of real estate? Yet these hon. gentlemen in their wisdom had determined that no man was eligible for a seat in that House unless he is worth £2,008 [sic] [of] real estate. They had heard a good deal about the secularization of the Reserves — but he and those gentlemen who acted with him in 1835 got their own way when they resolved to devote those Reserves th [sic] the rising generation for the support of Common Schools. Had they got their own way there would have been no need [sic] of any school Bills as at present. But there was a busy meddling priest like Egerton Ryerson, who plotted to destroy all their determinations, and after he had got his plans worked out he got the reward of his iniquity in the office he now fills, and keep[s] some two penny clerk to do his business. And now, every man who now finds that noble fund frittered away by the bad men who now hold office, and who will vote for these men to-night, will do an injury to the best interests of Canada. He might never come back to this House again, but he wished to see the country prosper; but these individuals can have no such feeling, they have been from first to last distasteful to the country. Another thing for which he disliked the Ministry was, that one and all of them moved to kick out the Maine Law. And yet had they substituted with the full majority they had at their command anything in its stead! One of them indeed stood up and said he was in favor of the Maine Law; but why did he stand alongside of these gentlemen who refused to take action in this matter, except for the £1,500 a year? He wanted to know if these gentlemen intended to pay the members of the Legislative Council \$6 a-day? He opened the door one day and went in just to see what they did for this money. Well, he heard a few short speeches in French, and in about fifteen minutes altogether the whole farce, no, he begged pardon of the House, the whole solemn proceeding was at an end. The hon. gentleman here referred at some length to the Grand Trunk Railroad in its inception, and in its subsequent development, and characterised it as a costly job altogether.... [He also alluded] to the Northern Railroad⁸². He found the entire system corrupt in every particular, and the reigning Government quite as bad as the system. They have no policy, neither as regards railways nor anything else. (Cries of "question!") That's what is wanted. He believed the ministry and their friends wished to postpone this debate once more, and avoid an expression of the opinion of the house, and if the hon. members who cry "question," will only consent to take the vote at this moment, he would sit down. The Government would not take the vote. If any member of the administration will agree to close the debate let them say so; but it is evident neither they nor their few adherents intend to accept the vote to-night. Some long-winded member on the other side will rise and keep on his feet till midnight.⁸³ The hon. member concluded by declaring that the Government were entirely unworthy of confidence, and that the vote that night would show it.⁸⁴

MR. RANKIN, amidst cries of question from several quarters, asked the indulgence of the House to make a few words of explanation.⁸⁵

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said if it was surely an explanation, he hoped the House would permit the hon. gentleman to proceed.⁸⁶

MR. RANKIN said he asked this permission simply because he on more than one occasion expressed the conviction which had made a deep impression upon his mind, that intriguing and unfair play had been practiced by the Attorney General.⁸⁷

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said the hon. general [sic] had asked to make an explanation, and he is now going on to make an attack upon the Attorney General.⁸⁸

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said it was the duty of the hon. member towards the House, not to introduce any new matter.⁸⁹

MR. RANKIN said he had no desire to bring on any new matter. He did not think he was asking anything unreasonable, in asking the indulgence of the House to make a few remarks, as he was not in

the habit of interferred [sic] with any gentleman who sought to address the House. He wished to call the attention of the House to the fact, that some of the explanations of the Attorney General had placed him in a position opposed to that which he wished to occupy. In his explanations the Attorney General mentioned his name as having been connected with a meeting which had taken place in the early part of the Session.⁹⁰ (Spoke, spoke.) He wished merely to explain the manner in which he happened to be present at that meeting.⁹¹

[Voices:] We know it.⁹²

[MR. RANKIN replied that] they did not know it. The Attorney General stated that three persons who had attended that meeting — (Confused cries of spoke, and question, question.) He (Mr. Rankin) begged to state that he attended there without knowing previously what the objects of it were. He received a note from Mr. Burton, inviting him to become his guest at an entertainment. He went to it not knowing that it was to be a political meeting, and it was not until it was over, and that they had refreshed themselves with champagne *ad libitum*, that he understood the true character of it. He could not recollect the precise language used there by any gentleman, but the general remarks of those present, was [sic] such as to convince him that it was an understood thing that the hon. and gallant knight was to retire. (Question, question.)⁹³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman could see that this was not an explanation.⁹⁴

MR. RANKIN said the statement made by the Attorney General was strictly correct. (Question, question.)⁹⁵

MR. HOLTON said as the Attorney General had been allowed three or four times to make explanations, ... he thought it unfair that the hon. member for Essex should not be allowed to explain.⁹⁶

MR. RANKIN thought it unfair that he should be interrupted. He would defy any one to say that he ever attempted to embarrass any one, although he had sat for hours listening to the speeches of others. He had no desire to repeat any expressions of a personal nature towards the Attorney [sic] General.⁹⁷

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said he objected simply because he did not think that any personal charge was made.⁹⁸

MR. RANKIN did not say that there had been a charge made, but there had been statements made which, if not explained, would place him in an unfair position before the country. (Question, question.)⁹⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the sense of the House was to allow the hon. gentleman to speak, but not to enter into any new matter.¹⁰⁰

MR. RANKIN made some few remarks, but as the House evidently seemed disinclined to hear, he sat down without making the reply which he sta[r]ted.¹⁰¹

MR. POWELL said he would agree with the member for Essex, that it was unfair to prevent any one from making a simple explanation — at the same time he congratulated the House upon the laudable spirit evinced upon the present occasion, to come to a vote so as to advance the business of the country. They had now been three months and fifteen days in Session, and he wished to know what they had to show to the country for it.¹⁰² Whether all the members who had such a zeal and desire that the business of the country should be proceeded with and a vote immediately come to upon this question, whether they had been from the beginning so anxious, the records of the house would demonstrate. And upon the present occasion he would not have desired to say one solitary word,¹⁰³ as he had from the introduction

of this motion expressed his intention to reserve himself in silence. But circumstances had occurred which rendered it necessary on his part to give expression to the opinions he entertained upon the question of confidence in the present ministry. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Powell) had entered at length into the public reasons which induced him to record his vote in favor of the motion before the chair on a previous occasion, expressing as it did a want of confidence in the then Government.¹⁰⁴ Those reasons in his opinion were just as powerful with respect to the present motion, and it was not his desire to repeat them. But he did desire as a member of the Conservative party which had been assailed in that house, not only by members from Upper but from Lower Canada;¹⁰⁵ as a member of the small section of the Conservative party, charged with creating the difficulties into which the party has been brought,¹⁰⁶ — (“Yes”)¹⁰⁷ — he felt it due to the House and to that party to state the reasons which had induced them to act as they had done. It had been said that the section of the Conservative party which withdrew from the Ministry were responsible for the difficulties in which the Government is now placed.¹⁰⁸ He repudiated this charge, and likewise that of treachery upon his part. Although young in politics he desired to have a character unblemished and unstained, and to build up a reputation as far as he was concerned, that though it may want the talent and ability which the gentlemen on the other side boast of, might be free from those imputations which were cast upon theirs. The history of the whole formation of the Government had been gone through from Genesis to Revelations, and it was not for him to repeat it. All he could say with respect to the very first meeting through which the hon. and gallant knight was charged by his Excellency to form an administration, that he expressed the opinions which he had entertained since; namely, that the step taken by which the coalition was formed was a false one. (Hear, hear.)¹⁰⁹ The Conservatives of the country had plumed themselves upon this Coalition;¹¹⁰ members of the Government [sic] had vauntingly cast before the country and the Conservative party the fact that to their industrious efforts the people were indebted for the Commutation clause in the Clergy Reserves Act. He had never held that opinion. He believed that if the Conservatives had held aloof from the formation of the Government at that time, and if they had been true to the principles they had held during their lifetime, and to the banner under which they had fought, if they had refused to accept the reins of Government under a Coalition or compromise that would involve a sacrifice of their principles, he believed that they would be in a higher position as far as the country’s interests are concern[ed]. He believed that the most ultra Radicals in this country, if the Government had been confided to their care, would have been ready to have adopted the Commutation clause in as favourable a light as it was adopted by the late Administration. If any proof be required they would find it in the fact that the principle of commutation was first put before the country in the *Globe* newspaper, edited by George Brown, and no Government, however Radical, could have been formed which would not have adopted¹¹¹ a measure so just, so equitable, if once the principle of secularization was adopted. But a different course was pursued by the party to whom he had belonged, to what he considered the proper one, and now while as deeply grieved as any man could be at separating from friends with whom he had sweet intercourse in his short political career, he felt that there was a duty higher than mere personal consideration, a duty which one owes not only to his party but to his country, and he hoped that with him that duty would always be paramount. At the first meeting of the Conservative party after the opening of the first session of this Parliament he moved that the Attorney General West should be the leader of the party, as he had always looked to that gentleman as his model as politician — but it was subsequently unanimously resolved that the gallant knight should be the leader — and from that moment to this he had never swerved in his allegiance [sic] to that gentleman.¹¹² He had never joined in any cabals against his leader, whose course had been such as to secure his admiration.¹¹³ But intrigues had been going on against the gallant premier, and there was no use attempting to make a secret of it, and the hon. gentleman who had been accused of that was the Attorney General West. He (Mr. Powell,) was not here to accuse that hon. gentleman, but there was no doubt that many members on both sides of the House waited upon the Attorney General — and they waited upon him to convey their desire for the removal of his leader. If that gentleman had been true to his leader he would at once have put down that caballing.¹¹⁴ The members of the Conservative party had been accused of treachery to the Coalition, but the treachery

had been on the part of Reform members of the house, who had said that they would oppose measures brought forward by the hon. member for Toronto, (Mr. Cameron) one of the Conservative supporters of the Administration, simply because they were brought forward by that gentleman. If the Coalition was destroyed it was chargeable to members of the Reform party, who were faithless to the pledges on which the Coalition was based.¹¹⁵ His hon. friend the member for Toronto had been charged with inconsistency in supporting the ministry while upon various occasions he was prepared to give them a determined opposition. But that hon. gentleman from the first formation of the Government dictated that while upon the Clergy Reserves and Elective Legislative Council Bill, he would do battle to the last against them, he would on other matters support the administration. The hon. member here referred at some length to matters connected with the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron).¹¹⁶ It had been stated that that gentleman had been a candidate for a certain judgeship and that he had been rejected, and the statement was offered in an organ of the Government and never contradicted, and yet he (Mr. Powell) had seen a letter in which the offer of that office had been made to Mr. Cameron in the most flattering terms. He [Mr. Powell] felt it his duty to support the last vote, and he felt it still more his duty to vote for the present motion.¹¹⁷ The former vote gave them a majority of some 23, and they repudiated that majority, and considering themselves defaced they resigned. It may be very well for these gentlemen to deny in theory the principle of the double majority; but they have admitted it in practice and yet there was not a more dangerous principle for the Province than [that] of the double majority. They were a united Province and they should look upon the Government as the "Government of Canada," and not as a mere section of Canada. If the principle of representation by population was carried out, and it could not long be withheld, upon what principle could they have the recognition of the system of double majorities. If they admitted it for a moment they strike a blow at the root and equitable principle of representation by population, which might prevent its being adopted in this country, if they admit it they create four parties in the House. The Government party for Upper Canada and the opposition party, and the Government party for Lower Canada, with the Lower Canada Opposition. If there was one evil greater than another it was this — election of various parties in one House. They had already felt it in the coalition. He trusted that the vote would show that, so far as this House was concerned, they were determined to repudiate a principal [sic] so dangerous to the political morality of this country — so subversive of its best interests. The hon. gentleman then alluded to the sacrifice of the Premier, and contended that every measure worth naming brought in by the coalition — with the exception of those measures which belonged to the previous administration — had been brought in by the gallant Premier. He could not account therefore for their desire to get rid of their chief. It was true they had introduced, in his stead, Mr. Vankoughnet, a gentleman for whom he, (Mr. Powell) entertained the highest respect, personally and politically. He was a man of unquestionable capacity and unswerving honesty; and more than that, he was a man of political character that would commend itself to this House so soon as he had an opportunity of being present with them. Charges had been made against him in reference to the speech he delivered in 1849, at Kingston,¹¹⁸ spoken of by Mr. Foley, [but] if that gentleman or the member for Lambton were addressing their constituents in the backwoods they would use far stronger language with regard to the position of Upper Canada, under the present constitution, than Mr. Vankoughnet did in his speech at the League.¹¹⁹ He, (Mr. Powell) would only say that the only fault felt with that speech at the time, was that he did not give that sufficient vigour to the opinions then entertained in Upper Canada, so far as Upper and Lower Canada were concerned. He had listened to that speech with pleasure, but it was made at a time when men's minds were excited. He thought that injustice had been done by attempting to raise a prejudice against Mr. Vankoughnet for that speech.¹²⁰ The hon. member went on to defend his hon. friend from South York from the attacks made on him by the members for South Simcoe and Prince Edward. In reference to charges of corruption against himself, he denied that he had ever sought or obtained favours from the Coalition Administration, and gave the details of what had occurred in connection with several appointments which had been made in his constituency.¹²¹ Therefore he betrayed no confidence in voting against them. He then read [sic] a lecture of some point to the Attorney General

West, for abandoning the hon. and gallant knight. He had not only lent himself to the faction, but he feared the hon. gentleman's mind was a little too much filled with ambition. They did not read history to no purpose — they read it to draw therefrom lessons of wisdom and experience, and as a warning to that gentleman, he would read the fate of all the prime ministers in England from the time of William the conqueror to the execution of Strafford. That document stated that there never yet was a prime minister in Britain that had not either broke his own neck or his master's, or both, unless he saved his own by sacrificing his master. In that light there had died [three] by the halter,¹²² nineteen had died by the axe, 4 in imprisonment, 4 in exile, 3 by sturdy beggars — (laughter) — and he thought there were enough sturdy beggars in this house to kill any Prime Minister — 1 had died penitent, and 4 had saved themselves by sacrificing their masters. (Hear, hear.) He could not pretend to predict the fate of the Attorney General, whether he would remain among the class who had sacrificed their masters, or add another unit to the one who died penitent. (Hear, hear,¹²³ [and] applause.)¹²⁴

DR. CLARKE had, during the course of the discussion, heard the word caballing, the word intriguing, and the stronger word truckling, used. When gentlemen are addressing gentlemen and such language used, there was reason to expect that it would be accompanied by some attempt at proof; he had listened for it carefully and had not heard one shade, one scintillation of proof advanced. And he believed that the general feeling in the house was that those accusations brought against his friend, the Attorney General West, have wholly failed. (No, yes.) Yes, not an iota of proof had been adduced, except the personal feelings of the members by whom they have been made can be considered as proof. He was sure that the house would acquit his hon. friend, and that the country would also acquit him. He had no regrets, like the member for South York, for any votes he had given in this house, but could conscientiously put his hand on his heart and say that every vote he had given was as sincere as the vote he meant to give to-night. Where did the caballing commence? Not with the great Conservative party. The great Conservative party voted with his honourable and gallant friend the late Premier, consistently and undeviatingly. If there was caballing it was on the part of that hon. gentleman's personal friends, who did that when he was sick and absent from his place, which they would not have ventured to do if he was present.¹²⁵ (Hear.) It was they that upset the Administration of which Sir Allan was the lead[er].¹²⁶ He [Dr. Clarke] had not been guided by any personal considerations in his support to the Government. If he had been refused the shrievalty of his county or the Crown Land agency of his county for his brother, that would be no reason for him to withdraw his confidence from him who was not merely the nominal but the actual head of his party. When the gallant knight came down and accepted the leadership of the party he had pledged his undeviating support, and that support had been given unhesitatingly on every vote. The whole Conservative party had been true to him throughout, and if there was caballing, most certainly it was not on the part of the Attorney General West. — He could say confidently in the face of the house and in the face of the country, that that gentleman had not caucussed, nor intrigued, nor caballed against his leader. He dare not in the face of the Conservative party attempt such a thing. The vote of the Conservative party to-night would prove that he was not guilty, and he hoped that the gallant knight would accept that vote as a proof that the caballing did not come from their side. That caballing might have come from personal considerations, and it might perhaps be within the knowledge of the gallant knight that the member for Carleton had repudiated his leadership, and acknowledged that of the member for Toronto.¹²⁷

MR. POWELL denied that he had done so.¹²⁸

DR. CLARKE replied that that was the only inference to be drawn from the hon. member's words.¹²⁹

MR. POWELL said the honourable member had consented to accept him as a leader of the young Conservative party.¹³⁰

DR. CLARKE replied that if he had done so it betrayed the greatest folly, the sheerest ignorance. He had consented to look to the member for Carleton to represent the opinions advanced at a joint meeting, and which he had not the manliness to do. He blamed the gallant knight for having accepted the resignation of his colleagues without acquainting his party with the course that he intended to pursue. If that had been done he would have felt that he had not lost the confidence of the great Conservative party, which had been continued undiminished almost up to the present moment. He also regretted that those gentlemen who had seen fit to attack Mr. Vankoughnet in his absence had not the courtesy to wait until he had taken his place in this house. When that gentleman did take his seat there it will be long before they dared to attack him.¹³¹

MR. DRUMMOND rose with great reluctance, at that late period of the debate, to make a few remarks. In doing so he would claim the indulgence of the House, having already had an opportunity of addressing the House, during this debate. When he rose on the previous occasion, however, it was to make certain explanations, which were expected of him. He did not, therefore, consider that he had yet had a fair opportunity of addressing the House, on the question before it. He should have been happy to have remained silent, but some of my previous remarks were of such a nature, perhaps, as to require explanation. He had been seriously misinterpreted, in a matter having reference to his late colleagues, which he was most anxious to have fully understood — not as they had been understood by some hon. gentlemen in that House. Now, he utterly repudiated the accusation made against him that he had declared his late colleagues, one and all, to be wholly incompetent for office. He never meant to make such a statement. But, on the contrary, he was fully convinced of the eminent departmental ability of many of them. And there were others of them, from Lower Canada, for whom he entertained the highest respect and regard, and with whom he had been bound in ties of the closest and warmest friendship for years, and for whom he should still continue to cherish the same feelings¹³², no matter what might be his political course through life.¹³³ Among those hon. gentlemen, he would especially name the late Provincial Secretary, of whose remarkable departmental ability, he had shown so many convincing proofs. He should also acknowledge the great services rendered to the country by Colonel Tache, and he would go further and say that in his opinion Colonel Tache had scarcely his equal among the public men of this country — whether as to the talents with which he was gifted, or the generosity of his nature in seeking to carry out every noble thought and suggestion. All he meant to say, on the occasion alluded to, was that these honorable gentlemen no more than any other individuals who had not applied themselves to the work of legislation for a sufficient length of time,¹³⁴ and the study of legislation, ... [could] carry out, as the people of Lower Canada required, and as their interests demanded, all the various subjects of Administration in Lower Canada.¹³⁵ Was that an insult to them? If so, then it was an insult also to himself, for he was several years in public life — and even two years after obtaining a Solicitor Generalship, — before he dare[d] undertake any business of great importance. It was well known that he did not adopt that course through a lack of legal acquirements, for during the preceding twelve or thirteen years his practice was of the most extensive and general character. Hence he was compelled to acquire an extensive knowledge of law. Yet¹³⁶, after he was appointed Sol. General, he found ... that it required years of study into the laws of Lower Canada, — which are to be found in hundreds and thousands of volumes — before it is possible to acquire any Administrative legal ability¹³⁷, and for several years he was incompe[te]nt to carry on the business of administration properly.¹³⁸ He meant no slight to any hon. gentlemen, as to their capacity or intellectual endowment¹³⁹. All he meant to say in making his former statement, was ... that long experience and attention devoted exclusively to these pursuits, could only secure those great reforms so much needed by the people of Lower Canada, in their laws. The same devotion was not required from hon. gentlemen holding similar offices in Upper Canada, because they were favored with the advantage of the common law of England; and they could adopt [sic] the English reforms to this country, without racking their brains for something new, as they must do in Lower Canada. In Lower Canada they had half a dozen various systems of law all mixed up together. Judgment was one day pronounced founded on the English

law, and the day following, founded on the French. Hence, a man must there devote years to the study of legislation alone, in order to enable him to carry out those great reforms.¹⁴⁰ It would be impossible to find any man in this country more admirably adapted to the situation which the Provincial Secretary filled up to the time of his (Mr. D.'s) withdrawal from the Government than himself, because he [Mr. Cartier] possessed unwearied assiduity, and was a good lawyer. During the eight years that he (Mr. D.) had been in the Government, no Provincial Secretary had relieved the Crown Lands from so much labour as he. (Hear, hear.) But at the same time, that sense of public duty which induced the Provincial Secretary to remain in the Government, and to take his (Mr. D.'s) place, compelled him (Mr. D.) then as it compelled him now, to declare to this house and to the country his opinion with regard to his efficiency.¹⁴¹ [He] went on to speak of the interpretation which had been given to his motives in refusing office. An attempt had been made to base that refusal on solely personal grounds, and therefore he felt bound to correct that mis-statement. When the late Government — of which he had the honor of being a member — broke up, he stood in that house as the leader of that party in Lower Canada, which sustained the Government by a majority of three to one.¹⁴² That Government supported by so strong a majority from Lower Canada was broken up by three gentlemen from Upper Canada, (hear, hear,) and this organization took place not only against his solemn protestations, but those of the other members from Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴³ The protestations were only founded on an anxious desire that the important business before the House should be carried through; and were connected with the belief that when the session was over, hon. gentlemen in the Upper Canadian section of the Cabinet would endeavor to recover the influence they had lost. His Lower Canada colleagues and himself strongly protested against any disruption taking place, supported as the Government was, by a majority of three to one in Lower Canada; and in the subsequent reformation of the Government, he, wishing to maintain in its proper position the party he had the honor to represent, only considered himself maintaining the honor of that party, in insisting in retaining in the Government the same position in regard to it, held by him previously. It was, in fact, merely insisting that that party should not be placed in a position of inferiority.¹⁴⁴ He thought that they would not consent to be placed in such a position, and there was no sacrifice which he would not have made to obtain his wishes¹⁴⁵. But, as he had before stated, he would under no circumstances have been prepared to join a reorganization whose perman[en]cy might have been despaired in.¹⁴⁶ Supposing that the conditions which he attached to his acceptance of office had been yielded, he would have taken care to make sure, that a gentleman proposing to come in to form a section of the Government from Upper Canada, would be supported by a majority from Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.)¹⁴⁷ He would perhaps, get credit for sufficient prudence in taking precaution that in the course of 24 hours or even eight days, he should not be again placed in the ridiculous position of being in a minority. (Hear, hear.) However, they found fault with his right, and consequently he refused to take office. But had he even consented to remain in, every politician should know that in so doing, he reserved for himself the right of testing the claims, prospects and influence of every man from Upper Canada that joined the ministry.¹⁴⁸ But was not Mr. Vankoughnet, after he (Mr. D.) had declined, brought into the Government, whom he (Mr. D.) never had an opportunity of testing? He had met that gentleman in public society and admired his genius and ability, but¹⁴⁹ did hon. gentlemen think he should have consented to join the organization without ascertaining the political views of Mr. Vankoughnet? Until the last member of the Cabinet had been chosen, their policy considered, and the open question, if any, determined on, he would not consider himself [in] any way bound by the Government, therefore no hon. gentleman should assert that he gave in his adhesion to that organization. He had not done so. He was not even informed of the intention of taking Mr. Vankoughnet into the Government, until the misunderstanding had taken place and he had left it. The Commissioner of Crown Lands seemed to be laboring under the delusion that he (Mr. Drummond,) was going to change his views as to the proper policy for the Government to pursue with reference to the Grand Trunk, the railway from Pembroke to Lake Huron, and the Seat of Government questions. Now, he had no such intention. The hon. gentleman here entered into an explanation of his views on these great questions. With reference to the Seat of Government, he should require to know from the

Government, positively, clearly and in a definite manner its determination with regard to an appropriation for the necessary public buildings. He was not aware that in the last Government — although the appropriation was brought down — that any positive policy had been determined on, of the course they should pursue in the event of the appropriation being refused. All their difficulties had arisen out of this question. It had, in fact, broken down the last ministry. When the question of a permanent seat was adopted, he had urged his colleagues strongly to come down to the House with an appropriation immediately after the vote of permanency had been taken, — appropriating a certain sum of money for that object, to be expended in sums not exceeding £50,000 annually. But his advice was disregarded and the ministry broke down. Was he not therefore justified in taking some precaution in entering another ministry, that they should be protected from the storm which was gathering at the horizon lest it burst on their heads. Perhaps, however, it might be said that he was excessively unskilful in dealing with difficulties. He did believe that he had been too long in power.¹⁵⁰

MR. MACKENZIE. — Hear, hear. That's the truth. (Laughter.)¹⁵¹

MR. DRUMMOND. — Well, the hon. gentleman is perhaps correct in what he says; although he could tell that hon. gentleman that he (Mr. Drummond) was two years longer in public life than the hon. member gave him credit for. However, some of his best friends seemed to think that he had come to love power — not for its emoluments, for they well knew that by retiring from office, he sacrificed at least £1,000 a year for the sake of power. Under this circumstance, some of his best friends gave him but a lukewarm support for some time past. Not long since, one of his best friends wrote to him, saying — “If you wish to continue to do good to the country and carry out all those reforms you wish, you must leave power for some time, in order to convince your friends you do not love power.” Under all these circumstances, he had withdrawn from power; but in doing so, he did not cease to be in a position to do good to his country.¹⁵² (Hear, hear, hear.)¹⁵³ Although withdrawn from the Government, he would still support them in every measure for the benefit of the country. In fact, had he not undertaken to carry out his measures in the House, the organization of a new Government under Col. Tache, would not have been completed to-day. The hon. gentleman then stated his regret that the motion before the House should have been proposed so soon after the formation of the Government, and before those great measures, the Seigniorial Tenure, the Decentralization of the Judiciary, the Grand Trunk and North Shore Railway bills, had been disposed of, as he felt that he could not vote confidence in the Administration.¹⁵⁴ He felt particularly anxious about the Seigniorial Tenure Act, which was necessary to enable the Commissioners to begin their operations.¹⁵⁵ He strongly condemned the views of some hon. gentlemen in the House, as regards the North Shore Railway.¹⁵⁶ He had not been driven into that [scheme] by pressure from without; but it had long been an idea of his, in this way to open up the unsettled wild lands. He was not opposed to the North Shore Railway; but when it was only to be a road between Montreal and Quebec, he told Mr. Cauchon that it should be built as any other private undertaking, — but that, if he would make it a national work, then he would support it.¹⁵⁷ He felt convinced it was a magnificent project, which, if carried out, would have the effect of opening up and making vocal with the hum of industry one of the finest valleys in the world, which now only echoed the cries of wild beasts or the sound of the waterfalls.¹⁵⁸ It was a practicable scheme, if only put before the country in a practicable shape; and he hoped that the Government would not be accused of corruption for a project to open up two of the finest valleys in the world. He (Mr. Drummond) was now about to withdraw from colleagues with whom he had long acted, and to declare that he had not confidence in their present organization. He was sorry, however, that they were not allowed to go on with the business of the country. He denied that the Seigniorial Tenure Bill had been carried by an Upper Canadian majority; and stated that the Municipal Bill had been carried through all its stages to the third reading by large majorities from Lower Canada, and at last was thrown out by an accidental majority. There was another Bill on which his reputation was at stake, and respecting which he had been attacked in the most fiendlike manner; he alluded to the General

Corporations Act; and with regard to that,¹⁵⁹ he would like to know if the Government were going to allow him to carry it through the House with the necessary alterations.¹⁶⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — It is a Government measure. We adopt it with all the hon. gentleman's amendments.¹⁶¹

MR. DRUMMOND. — He, then, would not stand alone, as guilty of the deep treachery that he had been accused of, with regard to his Church. No man respected the priesthood more than he did, and no man had stood more firmly by them; and now, because he wished to put all things of the kind on such a footing as would put an end to any jealousy, he was told that he had been a traitor, and had been hunted out of the Government. And he was glad that the Government would not shrink from the consequences of carrying out a measure of which they had all approved.¹⁶² [He] concluded by saying, that if he left the Government, he left it with the satisfaction of feeling that during his time in power, he never prostituted for corrupt purposes the patronage placed in his hands — during the whole of his term, he had never advised the election to office, of any one incompetent to fill it¹⁶³. He should look back with pleasure to many things that he had effected, during the eight years that he had been in power. He should look back with pleasure to the abolition of the last remnant of the Feudal Tenure — and also to the abolition, in Lower Canada, of imprisonment for debt, which was also one of the remnants of barbarism¹⁶⁴, and even inflicted a deeper disgrace than feudal bondage, and he regretted that in Upper Canada that measure still disgraced the statute books. To all these measures, he could look with pleasure, as indications that his exertions had been beneficial to his country. (Hear, hear.)¹⁶⁵ And he should look forward with pleasure to the time when the solitudes where the sound of the waterfall was the only sign of prosperity, should be rescued from the grasp of an indolent monopoly, and resound with the hum of industry.¹⁶⁶

MR. BELLINGHAM said that the House had arrived at a very important crisis, and one that it would have been better for the country had it never arisen. It was his opinion that the people of the country were dissatisfied with the present administration. The hon. gentleman then spoke at some length in vindication of his position in the ministry, as also in repudiation of the attacks made on him through the press.¹⁶⁷ [He] spoke in high terms of the new Secretary of the Province, and also of Sir Allan MacNab. He declared that, if the Government did not state that they could give no more aid to the Grand Trunk, he could not support them.¹⁶⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD rose to reply to some remarks made by the hon. member for Shefford [Mr. Drummond]. Without troubling the House at the present late hour by any lengthened remarks, [he] would simply confine himself to stating a few facts. At a meeting held before the resignation of the hon. and gallant knight from Hamilton, and at which the member for Shefford was present, Sir Allan asked all those present would they act with him, and they all agreed — including the member for Shefford, and they also agreed as to who was to be the leader. At that meeting no stipulation as to measures or bills was made by the member for Shefford; and instructions were then given to see him (Mr. McDonald), and nominate him as the leader; and the hon. member for Shefford as Attorney General. He (Mr. McD.) then went to Mr. Vankoughnet, and got his consent. The hon. member for Shefford and Mr. Drummond [sic] then called him, and he told them that the Cabinet was filled. Mr. Drummond agreed to every appointment, and subsequently to that Mr. Drummond even took his seat at the Council table.¹⁶⁹

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON would not have spoken at all had not the member for Shefford said what he did. The question at issue was, whether the resignation of that gentleman arose with reference to the leadership, or whether there was something else along with it. The speech of that gentleman has shown that that is the only question at issue. From the course he has now taken the House

must infer that he did not consider the Ministry strong enough to carry on the business of the country, and that therefore he retired. The hon. member for Shefford has said that he will not change his opinions as to his measures. Now, what was the use of that gentleman asking to know what would be the policy of the Government in regard to these measures, if he was determined not to change his opinions. He (Mr. Cauchon) was of opinion that what took place in Council ought not to have been told in the House. But he did not care about that. He (Mr. C.) did not see why he [Mr. Drummond] abandoned the Ministry, seeing that it was not the leadership that made him act in that manner. That gentleman has stated that the members comprising the Ministry are all honest (cries of question, question,) and only find fault with the Ministry because they all have not his experience. It then turns on the old question, that the Ministry is honest, has a certain amount of experience, and has been promised the support of the gentleman alluded to, in order that they may carry through their measures. Looking at these things, he (Mr. C.) would ask, why he would not give his support now; seeing that he has confidence in the Ministry, and the only fault he finds is that they have not enough of experience: the greater reason why that gentleman should join the Ministry, and give them the benefit of his experience.¹⁷⁰ (General cry of "question, question.")¹⁷¹

The members were called in, and the House divided on Mr. Dorion's motion of want of confidence.¹⁷²

(554)

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Bell, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, DeWitt, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Felton, Fergusson, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gamble, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jackson, Jobin, Laberge, Loranger, Lumsden, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Sir A.N. MacNab, Matheson, Mattice, Merritt, Munro, Murney, Niles, Papin, Patrick, Powell, Prévost, Rankin, Rhodes, Rolph, James Ross, Sanborn, Scatcherd, James Smith, Southwick, Wilson, and Wright.* — (54.)

(555)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Evanturel, Fellowes, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Price, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding.* — (58.)

So it passed in the Negative.¹⁷³

The result was received with cheers by the Opposition.¹⁷⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD rose and said. — I intend to move, in consequence of the lateness of the hour, the adjournment of the house. The main motion in your hands, I understand, is that the Speaker do leave the chair, for the house to go into committee.¹⁷⁵

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. — The motion is that the orders of the day be read.¹⁷⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — I was to have suggested that it was too late to go into committee.¹⁷⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD, rose amid a great deal of noise and confusion¹⁷⁸. — Are we to understand that the Government are to go on with the business of the country, after the vote which has just been taken?¹⁷⁹

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — Certainly.¹⁸⁰

General cry of "Yes" ... by the gentlemen on the ministerial benches¹⁸¹.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — In consequence of the lateness of the hour, I move that the house do now adjourn.¹⁸²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — The house and the country ought to know whether the Government mean to go on or not.¹⁸³

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — Certainly! Why not?¹⁸⁴

A Member. — Why should they resign, when they have a majority of four?¹⁸⁵

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — They resigned last week when they had a majority of twenty-three.¹⁸⁶

The House then adjourned¹⁸⁷.

(555)

Then the main Question being put; — It passed in the Negative.

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

The House adjourned until Monday next.¹⁸⁸

Footnotes

1. *Globe*, 31 May 1856, and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856, both report that this motion was made by Mr. Holton.
2. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
3. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
4. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
5. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
6. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
7. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
8. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
9. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
14. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
25. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.

26. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
27. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
28. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856.
29. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
33. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
34. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
35. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
40. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
42. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
43. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
47. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
48. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
51. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
52. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
53. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
54. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
55. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
56. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
57. *Ibid.*
58. *Ibid.*
59. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
60. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. For this part of Mr. Mackenzie's speech reconstituted as excerpts 60 to 68, the *Globe* and the *Toronto Daily Leader* vary in their ordering of the statements they report. The reconstitution was achieved by following the sequence reported in the *Globe*.
61. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
62. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
63. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
64. *Ibid.*
65. *Ibid.*
66. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Ibid.*
69. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
70. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
71. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
72. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
73. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
74. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
75. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
76. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
77. *Globe*, 31 May 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856, reports that Mr. Mackenzie "read from the Kingston *Argus* a speech delivered by Mr. Vankoughnet, in which he recommends moral force as the very thing to bring Lower Canadians to reason".

78. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
79. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
80. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. According to *Globe*, 31 May 1856, Mr. Mackenzie referred to Mr. Terrill's "annexational proclivities of 1845".
81. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
82. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. This newspaper also reports that "the House was beginning to get impatient" at this point in Mr. Mackenzie's speech.
83. *Globe*, 31 May 1856.
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
85. *Ibid.*
86. *Ibid.*
87. *Ibid.*
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Ibid.*
90. *Ibid.*
91. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
92. *Ibid.*
93. *Ibid.*
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
95. *Ibid.*
96. *Ibid.*
97. *Ibid.*
98. *Ibid.*
99. *Ibid.*
100. *Ibid.*
101. *Ibid.*
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
104. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
105. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
106. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
107. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
108. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
109. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
110. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
111. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
112. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
113. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
114. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
115. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
116. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
117. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
118. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
119. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
120. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. *Globe*, 2 June 1856, reports that Mr. Powell "warmly defended Mr. Vankoughnet from the unfair attacks of Mr. Foley".
121. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
122. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
123. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
124. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
125. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
126. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
127. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
128. *Ibid.*
129. *Ibid.*
130. *Ibid.*

131. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
132. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
133. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
134. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
135. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
136. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
137. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
138. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
139. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
140. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
141. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
142. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
143. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
144. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
145. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
146. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
147. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
148. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
149. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
150. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
151. *Ibid.*
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
155. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
156. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
157. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
158. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
159. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
160. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
161. *Ibid.*
162. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
163. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
164. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
165. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
166. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
167. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
168. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
169. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
170. *Ibid.*
171. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. This newspaper also remarks that Mr. Cauchon "was frequently interrupted by the impatience of the House".
172. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. *Globe*, 31 May 1856, in a commentary, reports the following information: "The House was crowded to suffocation during the evening, and even at the close of the debate, the galleries were filled with spectators, many of them ladies, eagerly watching the result. The last dull speaker had closed amidst the outcries of the House at the delay, the Speaker uttered the words which shut the mouths of unsatiated orators ('call in the members'), and all pressed forward to watch the rising of honourable members."
173. Several newspapers report commentaries regarding various aspects of this final division on Mr. A. Dorion's motion of non-confidence. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 6 June 1856, reports that "there were present in the House, 115 members, of whom three (the Speaker, Dr. Cook, and Mr. Drummond) did not vote. Absent only 15. The trial excited very great interest, both in town and country." *Le Pays*, 3 June 1856, lists the members absent from the vote: "MM. Blanchet, Cameron, Chisholm, Church, Cook (d'Oxford), Daly, Drummond, Egan, Ferrie, Flint, Morrison, Roblin, Sidney Smith, Terrill, Valois, Whitney et Young. — 17." *Globe*, 31 May 1856, also reports that "there were ten Upper Canadians absent. Of these three have sailed for England, Messrs. Cameron, Ferrie, and Sydney Smith; Mr. Flint for the Opposition paired off with Mr. Roblin for the Government; Messrs. Chisholm, Church, Cook, and Daly did not appear, the first named being detained by illness in his family; and one seat (Niagara) is vacant."

Perth Courier, 6 June 1856, reports the following information regarding the vote: "The Upper Canada vote stood 20 for the Ministry, and 35 against, leaving them in a minority of *fifteen* in Upper Canada — a clear gain to the opposition of *nine* votes within one week. — Not a single Reform member from Upper Canada voted for the Ministry, showing conclusively that the Reform party have gone over to the Opposition *en masse*, leaving Messrs. Spence and Morrison all alone in their glory."

Furthermore, several newspapers note that although the division of 54 Yeas to 58 Nays gave the new Administration a majority of four in their favour, had it not been for their own 8 votes, they would have found themselves in a minority of four. Taking this into consideration, *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 6 June 1856, thus analyses the result of the division:

"35 Upper Canada Members voted to turn the Coalition out; 34 Lower Canada Members voted to keep them in. Majority 1.

"19 Lower Canada Members voted to turn the Coalition out; 16 (and no more) Upper Canada Members voted to keep them in. Majority 3....

"The full vote condemning their conduct was 54: for them 54 [sic]: adverse majority 4.

"They were allowed, however, to vote for themselves, and that made a nominal majority in their favor of 4."

Many newspapers also comment on the absence from the vote of Mr. Drummond and Dr. Cook, and on the vote of Messrs. Bellingham, Turcotte, and Marchildon. One of them, *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 4 June 1856, reports the following comment: "Mr. Drummond, in his speech of Wednesday evening, declared that he had made up his mind to vote against his late colleagues. He was in his place on Friday evening, evidently intent upon carrying out his promise; but when the division was called, the honorable gentleman had vacated his seat, and was seen wandering about the lobbies. Rumor has it that the ex-Attorney General was bought off with an offer of £1500 per annum for codifying the laws of Lower Canada." *Globe*, 31 May 1856, after giving similar information regarding Mr. Drummond, states the following: "Mr. Bellingham ... was the last person who spoke. He announced that in consequence of the declaration of the Government, that they intended to give a large amount of aid to the Grand Trunk Company, he would vote against them. Immediately afterwards, he was observed to be carried off to a private room adjoining the chamber, by Messrs. Cayley and Macdonald, and in five minutes he returned *and voted for the Government*."

"Dr. Cook, the member for the South Riding of Oxford was in town, but was absent from the vote, for reasons best known to himself. He voted against the Government on the last resolution of want of confidence, and has declared himself against the new shuffle; he was not unwell; he was absent. Had Mr. Bellingham voted as he spoke, and Mr. Drummond and Mr. Cook been in their places, there would have been a tie, and Mr. Speaker would have been under the necessity of deciding the fate of the ministry."

Other similar remarks are reported in the commentaries of *Toronto Daily Leader*, 31 May 1856, *Le Pays*, 3 June 1856, *Montreal Transcript*, 3 June 1856, *Perth Courier*, 6 June 1856, and *Western Planet*, 9 June 1856.

174. *Globe*, 2 June 1856. *Globe*, 31 May 1856, reports in a commentary that, the vote having been announced by the clerk, "thereupon arose from the Opposition a shout of victory, which was but feebly answered from the ministerial benches."
175. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
176. *Ibid.*
177. *Ibid.*
178. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
179. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
180. *Ibid.*
181. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856.
182. *Globe*, 2 June 1856.
183. *Ibid.*
184. *Ibid.*
185. *Ibid.*
186. *Ibid.*
187. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856. The following newspapers report commentaries regarding the events of the last two weeks of May 1856 and the position of the new Administration: *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2, 7 and 14 June 1856, *Le Pays*, 3 June 1856, *Hamilton Spectator Semi-Weekly*, 4 June 1856, *Perth Courier*, 6 June 1856, *Western Planet*, 9 June 1856, and *La Minerve*, 12 June 1856.
188. *Globe*, 2 June 1856, and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 2 June 1856, both report that the House adjourned "at half-past twelve".

MONDAY, 2 JUNE 1856

(555)

MR. SPEAKER communicated to the House a Letter addressed by the Clerk of this House to Mr. *Paul Kane*, Artist, on the subject of certain Oil Paintings to be furnished by him to the Legislative Assembly, and Mr. *Kane's* reply to the said Letter, which were read; and are as follow: —

Clerk's Office, Legislative Assembly,

Toronto, 29th May, 1856.

Sir, — The Honorable the Legislative Assembly having, on the 28th instant, concurred in the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Contingencies, and thereby made the recommendation contained in that Report, an Order of the House; I hereby, in obedience to that Order, inclose you an Extract of the said Report, and call upon you forthwith to execute your agreement therein mentioned, by delivering to me the Paintings therein referred to; and I inform you that, in case of your non-compliance, legal proceedings will be instituted against you and your surety.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W.B. Lindsay,

Clerk Assembly.

To *Paul Kane*, Esquire,
Artist, *Toronto*.

Toronto, 30th May, 1856.

(556)

Sir, — I have to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter of the 29th instant, conveying to me the Orders of the Honorable the Legislative Assembly in relation to the terms of my agreement made, in 1851, with that Honorable House, by which twelve Oil Paintings were to be supplied by me in return for an aid, to the extent of £500, awarded me in that year towards the completion of a series of Paintings, and the publication of the same, illustrative of my travels and adventures in the North Western wilds of this Continent.

I cannot better reply to that communication than by begging you to lay before the House the accompanying copy of a letter delivered by me on 21st instant to Mr. *Chisholm*, M.P.P., for the purpose of laying it before the Contingent Committee. That gentleman having left Town and omitted to forward to the Committee the letter referred to containing my explanations, I conceived it my duty to wait upon the Committee personally, to whom I verbally delivered the substance of the letter now enclosed, and with which they manifested their satisfaction.

I may remark, that the Report of the Committee had been already presented when I became aware of its contents, which will account for my inability to anticipate the action of the House by explanations which I have always been ready to afford.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Paul Kane.

To *W.B. Lindsay*, Esquire,
Clerk Legislative Assembly.

Mr. *Paul Kane* begs leave to bring under the notice of the Contingent Committee the following circumstances connected with his agreement to furnish the House of Assembly with twelve Paintings, in consideration of receiving £500, which was paid to him in 1851: —

In the first place, Mr. *Kane* begs to state that the understanding arrived at between Mr. *Hincks*, Mr. *Malcolm Cameron*, and the other Gentlemen with whom he was in communication when the grant referred to was made, was that the Paintings should only be supplied to the House after Mr. *Kane* had finished his complete series, which he has now been exclusively engaged at for eleven years and has not yet accomplished. The object of his application to the House was for a gratuity to enable him to devote himself entirely to that work with a view to

the publication of his Pictures, in illustration of a narrative of his travels and adventures in the North-West, which he intended, and still intends giving to the Press. It will be obvious to the Committee, and this view was at once admitted to be reasonable by the Committee in 1851, that out of a series of Paintings intended for publication under copyright, to make twelve choice selections and expose them in an apartment public as the Library of the Legislature, would effectually destroy his right, and in fact the necessity of securing such copyright, as nothing could prevent the public from obtaining access to them for any purpose they might desire. The arrangement, therefore, was that these Paintings should be presented to the House as soon as it could be done without any such danger.

In explanation of the period elapsed since the arrangement was effected, Mr. *Kane* begs the Members of the Committee to consider that he has been many years engaged at the work in question in his own interest, and that no delay that was not absolutely indispensable in so voluminous a work can reasonably be supposed to have been voluntarily incurred.

These remarks Mr. *Kane* offers in justification of himself and of the time transpired since he undertook that engagement; he has now, however, to inform the Committee that, anticipating that the return of the Government to *Toronto* would be immediately followed by a demand of the nature now made upon him, he waived the considerations above set forth, and has now been for some months occupied in preparing the series intended for the House, which he hopes to complete by the close of the Summer. He, therefore, requests that the Committee will be good enough to withdraw their Report, which was prepared and presented without his being called upon to offer any explanations, and suspend action in the matter until the opening of the next Session, when Mr. *Kane* will be prepared to place the twelve Paintings in the hands of the proper Officer of the House, on the understanding that such precautions as he may suggest will be adopted to prevent his prospective copyright being infringed, in furtherance of the understanding on which was based as well Mr. *Kane's* original application, as the liberal action of the Committee upon it.

Toronto, 21st May, 1856.

Ordered, That the said Letters be referred to the Standing Committee on Contingencies.

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Freeman*, — The Petition of *Benjamin Soules* and others, of the Township of *Salfleet*.

By Mr. *Bellingham*, — The Petition of *C.J. Forbes* and others, owners of lands, residing between *Carillon* and *Grenville*, in the County of *Argenteuil*.

By Mr. Solicitor General *Ross*, — The Petition of *J.O. Labranche* and others, of *Metgermette* and other Townships, County of *Beauce*; the Petition of *Ambroise Morin*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. François*, County of *Beauce*; the Petition of the Reverend *A. Campeau* and others, of the Parish of *St. George d'Aubert Gallion*, County of *Beauce*; and the Petition of *Zépherin Bertrand*, Mayor, and others, of *Tring* and other Townships, County of *Beauce*.

By the Honorable Mr. *Cayley*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Greenock*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of the Municipal Council of the County of *Terrebonne*; praying for a Survey of the North River in the said County, and that it may be rendered navigable.

Of the Municipality of the Townships of *Camden* and *Zone*; praying that power may be given to Township Councils in *Upper Canada*, to raise the amount of commutation for statute labor from 2s. 6d. to 5s. per day.

Of *David Wylie* and others, of *Brockville*; praying that the Tariff of Customs may be so amended as to afford encouragement to native enterprize, upon equal terms with foreign competition.

Of *Joseph Gosselin* and others, of the Parish of *St. Irenée*; praying that in uniting the County of *Saguenay* to the County of *Charlevoix* for judicial purposes, the chief place may be continued at *Les Eboulements*.

Of the *Canadian Institute of Toronto*; praying that a Clause may be inserted in the Act passed in 1853, regulating Grammar Schools of *Upper Canada*, which will confer upon *Lower*

Canada the advantages now enjoyed by *Upper Canada* in the prosecution of Meteorological Observation and Researches.

Of *James Sanson* and others, of the Township of *Nottawasaga* and the Town of *Collingwood*; praying that a Clause may be inserted in the Bill to incorporate certain persons under the name and style of the Lake *Huron* Transit Company, to enable the Municipality of *Nottawasaga* and the Town Council of *Collingwood* to take Stock in the said Company.

Of *O.E. Casgrain* and others, of the County of *L'Islet*; praying that the Parish of *L'Islet* may be made the chief place of the new Judiciary District of *Montmagny*.

Of the Municipality of the Township of *Wawanosh*; of the Municipality of the Township of *Saugeen*; of the Municipality of the Township of *McKillop*; and of the Municipality of the Township of *Tuckersmith*; praying for certain amendments to the Assessment Law of *Upper Canada*.

On motion of Mr. *Bellingham*, seconded by Mr. *Bell*,

(558) *Ordered*, That the Petition of *C.J. Forbes* and others, owners of lands, residing between *Carillon* and *Grenville*, in the County of *Argenteuil*, be now received and read, and the Rules of this House suspended as regards the same.

And the said Petition was received and read; praying for certain amendments to the Act of Incorporation of the *Montreal* and *Bytown* Railway Company.

Mr. *Hartman*, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presented to the House the Twentieth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have examined the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Montreal* to borrow a sum of Fifty thousand pounds for the purpose of completing the new Water Works in the City of *Montreal*," and have agreed to report the same, without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Montreal* to borrow a sum of Fifty thousand pounds for the purpose of completing the new Water Works in the City of *Montreal*," be read the third time To-morrow.

Mr. *Ferres*, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented to the House the Nineteenth Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth: —

Your Committee have examined the following documents referred to them, and recommend that they be printed *in extenso*, viz: —

Return to an Address for a Return of the Explorations and Surveys made within the last year in the Territory lying to the North of the Counties of *Peterborough* and *Victoria*, with the Reports made by the Surveyors employed on that service, shewing the Roads proposed to be opened, with the extent of lands embraced in such Survey or Exploration, and the quality of the same, and the quantity thereof fit for Agricultural purposes. The usual number of copies. Estimated expense, Eleven pounds.

And Return to an Address for a Return shewing the amount of land originally held by the *Toronto* General Hospital for the benefit of that charity, the quantity of lands disposed of, the value of the same, the dates of sale, and to whom sold; the income and expenditure of that Institution from the time of the Union, the sources of Revenue, including the annual amount of pay patients, and the amount actually received from the same; the number of patients, amount actually received from the same, the number of patients admitted annually, the classification or nature of their disease, the number of convalescent patients discharged, the number discharged as incurable; also, the number of deaths, the nationality of patients as far as can be ascertained; also, a copy of all correspondence that has passed between the late or present Governments and the Hospital Trustees in reference to the removal of the said Hospital to its present unhealthy location; and also any correspondence that may have passed between the same in relation to the disposal of any of these lands. The usual number of copies. Estimated cost, Eighty-five pounds.

MR. BOWES moved that the house go into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to incorporate the Colonial Bank of Canada, just reported from the Private Bill[s] Committee.¹

This was opposed by MESSRS. J.S. MACDONALD and MACKENZIE on the ground that the proposed proceeding was out of order, and contrary to the rules of the house.²

MR. BOWES defended his course, as being the only one to pursue under the circumstances.³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that the practice of the house had been to allow bills to be taken up in this way⁴ during the Session.⁵

MESSRS. BROWN and GAMBLE contended that it would be very unfair to take up this Bill in preference to others of a similar nature, which had been for months upon the notice paper.⁶

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH and MR. FERRES spoke in favor of [the motion].⁷

MR. MACKENZIE moved in amendment, that the Bill as amended by the Private Bill[s] Committee be printed for the use of members.⁸

MR. BOWES said that if the house would agree upon a day on which to take up all the Bank Bills together he would withdraw his motion.⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ruled that when a bill of this nature was moved for consideration in committee, similar [ones] might be moved to the same committee.¹⁰

The bill was then left for consideration in committee of the whole to-morrow.¹¹

(558) *Ordered,* That the Bill to incorporate the *British Bank of Canada*, as reported from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, be committed to a Committee of the whole House, for To-morrow.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD rose and said, that in order to expedite the business of the Session, he would propose that the unopposed notices of motion should be first taken up by the House.¹²

MR. MACKENZIE. — I oppose it.¹³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD ... [said] he did not desire that any motions that members wished to proceed with should not be taken up, but that the unopposed ones should be first proceeded with.¹⁴

MR. MACKENZIE would object to this proposition because his motion in regard to the decimal currency stood at the top of the notice-paper a month or six weeks ago, and he would not be allowed to take it up. If the Government wished to expedite the business of the House, the best way they could do so, would be by resigning their seats. (Hear, hear.)¹⁵

MR. BROWN. — When the Attorney General rose, the House expected that it would hear from him some explanation as to the course which the Government intended to pursue with regard to the vote of Friday night. The Attorney General must know that the house was entitled to some explanation on that point.¹⁶ A few days ago, the Government retired in consequence of an adverse Upper Canada vote of six — although at the same time sustained by a majority of 23. On Friday night, however, they received an adverse vote — not of six, as on the previous occasion — but of fifteen — being only sustained by a majority of four, including their own votes! And yet these hon. gentlemen announced their intention of going on with the business of the country! Now, he (Mr. Brown,) thought the House was entitled to some explanation of such an extraordinary course of conduct.¹⁷ They should tell us how, in the face of such facts as these, they are found here in their seats to-day. They may have changed their minds — they

may have resolved to change the course they took before. The responsibility they felt themselves under on that occasion may be removed; but if such is the case we are entitled to know it, for it is a matter of very grave importance that ministerial changes should be conducted on some constitutional principle. The House should be informed whether the principle on which they resigned before was abandoned, and what reason they had for so abandoning it — why they should take a different stand now to what they did before.¹⁸ With regard to the business of the country, the Government must see that such a course was almost impossible. How could they attempt to carry on the business of the country with their present miserable majority?¹⁹ If they have determined to go on only with a portion of their measures, the house is entitled to know it. He did hope that the Attorney General would give full explanations on these points.²⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that during the last week, the most simple explanations had been entered into on this subject by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. And he should not be induced to go into a repetition of them. It would be remembered that during that debate, the House expressed a unanimous desire that the business of the country should be proceeded with. The member for Shefford and the hon. and gallant knight from Hamilton were amongst those who expressed such an opinion. Indeed, it seemed to be the universal wish of the House that the public interests generally, and those great questions now before the House, should not be longer held in abeyance. Acting on this wish, the Government were quite prepared to go on with the business of the country. They were quite willing to do as much as they could under the full sense of their responsibility²¹, and they hoped to have the assistance of this house to enable them to hurry the session to an end as soon as possible;²² but at the same time they would not allow any of the material interests of the country to be injured by the haste with which they might be hurried through, or the opposition they would meet with. Their intention was to carry through the principal Government measures, and lay before the House their scheme with respect to the Grand Trunk Railway, and they asked the House to assist them in carrying out that course. Spring was now gone, summer was coming in, and every day's delay sacrifices, to a certain extent, the interests of the Province. He therefore hoped the House would give such aid as they could in bringing their measures to a happy, successful and immediate conclusion. It was of great consequence that these measures should be passed; but if by reason of any factious opposition they were unable to carry these measures, then the responsibility would rest on the right shoulders.²³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD thought the explanation of the Attorney General very unsatisfactory. He said it was of importance that those great questions before the house yet undecided should be carried out. But it was of much greater consequence to the people of this country that some constitutional course should be defined by the Government on an occasion when they had been found wanting in the confidence of the people's representatives.²⁴ It was of much more confidence [sic] that it should be determined whether a Government should be allowed to carry on the business [sic] of the country, contrary to the constitutional practice relative to the double majority system. It was strange to hear the Government asking the assistance of the House, in order to carry their measures, when only two days had elapsed since the House had declared those hon. gentlemen incapable of carrying on the business of the country. Was there ever a ministry in a position similar to that in which the present ministry was placed. Beaten on two separate occasions, they yet had the audacity to insult the House by coming back again and resuming the Government in a still more obnoxious manner.²⁵ The vote had shewn that the Administration had not strengthened but weakened itself by the change which had taken place. As to the measures which had been referred to, he would rather they should go to the wall than that they should proceed without a defined policy, without some defined declaration as to the course the Administration, under present circumstances, were going to take. They had found it convenient to invoke the double majority principle, when they wished to get quit of the gallant knight, but once they got quit of him, they ignored that principle, although their majority of the whole House had fallen from 23 to 4, and the Upper Canada

majority against them increased from 6 to 15.²⁶ Those hon. gentlemen modestly say — let us carry out our measures — say nothing about that double majority system. It was all very well while the hon. and gallant knight was in our way, but now that he is removed, we won't acknowledge such a vicious principle. Thus it is they would endeavor to set aside a principle which has been in operation since 1841, and trample on the rights and privileges of the country.²⁷ He meant to give the house an early opportunity of pronouncing on that principle, by moving an Address to the Governor. He considered it a duty he owed to the country to take that course, but he had not asked any of his friends to follow him.²⁸

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — There is no fear of that. They won't follow you.²⁹

[MR. J.S. MACDONALD] would ask no hon. gentleman to follow him, but merely asked to lay his motion on the table of the House. And if the House negatived it — for nothing would surprise him in the present state of affairs — then all he could say was, that he had discharged his duty and would put up with any disappointment that resulted.³⁰

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said it was perfectly evident, from the observations of the hon. member for Glengarry, that he intended to obstruct all the useful measures of the country³¹, by bringing up his motion on the double majority system, the effect of which would be to repeat the debate which had already lasted for three weeks.³² He was, as he had distinctly stated, prepared to let all the great measures before the country go to the wall; for the sake of party difference he was prepared to sacrifice all the great measures of the country. Now, he (Mr. Smith) hoped these great measures would not be thus thrown aside. He hoped they would be carried out, he did not care by whom. From the present aspect of affairs, he supposed they would have more votes similar to those which had taken place last week; and that a similar waste of valuable time would result. Now when he said that the hon. member for Glengarry had no followers, he simply meant that he would have none in this question. And he hoped the House would see the necessity that existed for pushing matters forward at this late period of the session. What did the hon. member for Glengarry mean by his assertion that the ministry had insulted the House?³³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — It has been insulted by the calling back into the councils of his Excellency, individuals who had lost the confidence of this house, and the withdrawal of confidence in whom was manifested by an unmistakeable vote.³⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — That might have been said before the vote of last week, but not after the House have sustained the Ministry.³⁵

MR. BROWN. — Your own votes alone saved you!³⁶

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — Are the ministry to be mere ciphers, and by not voting allow hon. gentlemen opposite to obtain a majority over us.³⁷ The ministry had ... an undoubted right to receive their own votes on the question. He hoped the House would discontinue such opposition and allow them to proceed with the business of the country.³⁸

MR. MACKENZIE said he would state further for the information of the learned Solicitor General, how the House had been insulted. If he (Mr. Mackenzie) understood the principle of Responsible Government correct[ly], it meant that the representatives of the people alone, should be the advisers of the Crown. And yet after the late adverse vote had been recorded against the Ministry, instead of seeking His Excellency's advisers among the 130 representatives composing that House — or else dissolving it — they went outside the House in order to select a member of the Executive, in the person of a Chancery lawyer. If that was not an insult — and a gross insult too — to the House and the country, he was utterly at a loss to know what an insult meant.³⁹ The Government last week were put in the minority? They

said they did not want to hurry the debate, because they were on their trial, but that did not prevent them from giving their own eight votes which gave them a majority of four. If they had not voted for themselves, they would have been in a minority of four. Then by Dr. King's letter, it appeared that they considered themselves bound by Mr. Baldwin's rule to resign, when there was an Upper Canada majority against them. Why then did they hold on to office, when the Upper Canada majority against them had increased from six to fifteen?⁴⁰ The Government now sought to carry on the business of the country with a majority of four [in the whole House], while but a few days ago they professed their inability to carry it on with a majority of 23! Nor would they even have had that miserable majority had the member for Argenteuil voted as he professed his willingness to do, [and] had the hon. member for South Oxford been manly enough to have come forward and recorded his vote⁴¹. The member for Shefford (Mr. Drummond) after making an extraordinary speech, stood at the door and did not give his vote. The foolishlest person from the Asylum could have done as well as that. He stood out against them at the outset, but when he was told by his successors that they would give him a job to amend the laws, he shirked voting. He certainly was a miserable picture of an Attorney General or anything else.⁴² Now, although he [Mr. Mackenzie] had always been a steadfast opponent of the hon. and gallant knight from Hamilton, and always would be, still he should say, that he gave him every praise for his conduct on that occasion, in boldly recording his vote against a Ministry in whom he had no confidence. He could admire the str[a]ightforward conduct of the hon. and gallant knight on that occasion,⁴³ but a dissimulating sneak, who was afraid to vote against the Government lest they should keep in, and was afraid to vote for them lest the Opposition should get in — such a person he did not like, and he was not a remarkable credit to any constituency.⁴⁴ The hon. gentleman concluded by again denouncing the Ministry in taking office, after the House had distinctly declared its want of confidence in them.⁴⁵

MR. DRUMMOND. — I beg to tell the hon. gentleman, that I never swerved from my course for a consideration.⁴⁶ I know that hon. gentleman cannot appreciate the motives which induced me to abstain from giving my vote the other night. Men of such feelings as his never can appreciate the position of one who entertains a generous feeling. I abstained from giving that vote, in the first place from feelings of delicacy towards the men whom I had left some few days before, after extending to them the hand of friendship. I was in a different position from the gallant knight. Had I been in his position, I would have voted against the Government, and done everything in my power against them. I would have spoken as the gallant knight has done; and taking into consideration some facts which have come out since, not then revealed, I would have spoken with much greater indignation than the gallant knight thought proper to do. But for myself, I had no fault to find with them. I left them in sorrow. I had the sorrow of friendship at breaking with friends, who had treated me in the warmest and most cordial manner all the time I was connected with them.⁴⁷ Therefore it was that ... [I] did not wish to be unnecessarily harsh.⁴⁸ The hon. gentleman does not understand that feeling, and I want no sympathy from him. I should scorn his sympathy and scorn his praise. I should think I had committed some serious injury, some serious crime against my country, had I obtained his praises for what I did. But I had other motives for abstaining from voting. One was that I would not assume the responsibility of stopping measures which have been carried down to their last stages by large majorities of this house. There is, for instance, the Seigniorial Tenure Amendment Act, the not carrying out of which may, to a great extent, stop the operations of the commissioners, and prevent the completion of that great Reform, the greatest ever attempted in this country. Nor could I attempt to stop the carrying out of the Judicial Decentralization Bill, approved of by large majorities of this house. And I would not attempt to stop the carrying out of the schume [sic] for aid to the Grand Trunk, which would stop the Victoria Bridge and within one month occasion a loss to the Company⁴⁹ [OR] to the Country⁵⁰ of £100,000. And again, looking to the means which may be resorted to, not by all the members of the Government, but by some of them, against myself and my friends, I was anxious they should nail their colours to the mast in regard to the Religious Incorporations Bill, — that they should not be in a position to say that it was my work and not theirs — to say as has been said in some

of their journals, that I have been a traitor to my religion and my country. I want them to show to the country, that they are responsible, every one of them, for that measure as well as myself. And if I have abstained from voting, it was not from the mean motives, which an hon. gentleman who looks only to his six dollars a day, can alone understand. It was from other higher and nobler motives, for which my friends and the country will give me credit. And I had another motive. I did not wish to break at once with those members of this house who had supported me so nobly. I believe the most of them have still confidence in me, and they submit to circumstances in supporting the Government in the pitiable plight in which it now stands. — (Hear, hear.) No one regrets more than myself, the position in which they stand. It is a position in which they cannot stand⁵¹ for three weeks⁵² long[er], and they are bound to come down and tell the house and the country what they mean to do. I am prepared to support them. I ask them to look at the position of the Derby Ministry when organized with a majority of the house against them. They said to the House of Commons — “there are various important measures which the interests of the country demand; we come and throw ourselves on your indulgence for the carrying of those measures; but while doing so, we tell you that so soon as such and such measures are carried we will dissolve the house, and appeal to the country.” (Hear, hear.) Let the Government then have the courage to say what they are going to do — whether, after certain measures are carried, they intend to dissolve the house. And if they say that, I ask the members from Lower Canada whether it was right for the Government to place the representatives of Lower Canada in such a position — if it was right, when they commanded a majority of their votes of three to one, to compel those who stood by them to go back to the country.⁵³

MR. MACKENZIE. — Did you not in June 1854, when we had only been nine days in session, without allowing us to go on with the public business — did you not bring down the Governor and dissolve us without an hour’s notice?⁵⁴

MR. DRUMMOND. — That was a very different position, and we did not then hesitate to say what course we intended to pursue. What I want from the ministry at the present moment — not to-day, because they may have been taken a little short — but some day soon, say to-morrow, is that they should come down and let us know what they are to do, whether they intend to remain in office, after having declared ten days ago that their efficiency was so completely impaired that they could not carry on the business of the country, because they were not sustained by an Upper Canada majority. I want to know if they have changed their opinions since⁵⁵; and if so, what course they ... [intend] to pursue.⁵⁶ But in any circumstances I am prepared to assist them in carrying their business through the house. I look upon it as a matter of paramount importance as compared with all party considerations that [sic] the measures to which I have referred should be carried through now, because all those measures with the exception of the Grand Trunk scheme⁵⁷ [have] been carried through to the last stage by the late Ministry⁵⁸ [with] the assent of large majorities of this house, and the Government owe it to the house to say what course they intend to adopt in regard to them⁵⁹, in order to allow the House and the country time to express approval or disapproval of that policy.⁶⁰ (Hear, hear.) Now I really thing [sic] there is not a man in this house except the member for Haldimand — who could have brought this charge against me. I do not think the member for Lambton — in his paper he has said something of the kind, but that gentleman of course has no connection with the paper — I do not think the member for Lambton could believe I was influenced by any motive of the kind, by any hope of a temporary office from gentleman [sic] who cannot retain power for more than three weeks at the most, unless they dissolve and keep power till Parliament meets again, and then I am sure they will not remain in office. — (Hear, hear.) But I think I should be wanting in my duty to my country if I did not offer assistance in carrying out necessary measures, without, however, receiving one sixpence of emolument, at the hands of the Government. I could not receive it from them. I joined in the laughter which the remarks of the new Attorney General about the codification of the laws elicited the other night. He said I was the best man for the duty, and it was looked upon as a bait thrown out. But I have too high an opinion of my hon. friend, too high an appreciation of his

estimation of myself, to think for one moment that he made those observations with any such object in view, I cannot think for one moment that that hon. gentleman who knows that I never would stoop to buy a vote could think that my vote would be bought. I never stooped even to beg a vote. I appeal to hon. gentlemen whether they ever saw me going about and soliciting votes on any Government question. The only question on which I ever entreated members to vote in a particular way, was the Seat of Government question, which was an open one. But on Government questions I felt that soliciting votes would be looked upon by some as [if] I were begging my daily bread.⁶¹ Nor should he [Mr. Drummond] ever stoop to do so, so long as he could work, (hear, hear.)⁶²

MR. WILSON would like to know upon what principle the members of the present administration resigned upon the former occasion, and now asked the house to permit them to go on with the business of the country standing before it in their present position? If they were not competent to carry on the business of the country at that time, what had made them competent to carry it on now? They would no doubt in reply say that they resigned, but what did that resignation signify? Nothing. It was a mere farce, and they took advantage of the Constitution, and went against its very spirit in taking their seats again without going back to the country for approval. If they were willing to stand before the country with any confidence in their present position, he was satisfied. But there was another fact to which he wanted to call attention. If he understood the principle correctly upon which the Government was to be carried on, it was that gentlemen holding departmental offices in this house should be members of it, and that within a reasonable time after they had taken office and were sworn in. Mr. Vankoughnet had been sworn in by the Executive Council, and was appointed President of the Council, and head of the Bureau of Agriculture⁶³, but he would like to know where the honorable gentleman was going to find a seat, or when he expects to get one. As yet there was no vacancy for him. How then, was he going to fulfil the duties of his offices? If one gentleman held office in the Council without a seat, then might six, eight, or any number, and they would just occupy the position they had occupied before the introduction of Responsible Government.⁶⁴ He would like the Administration to explain upon what principle they meant to justify their conduct in advising his Excellency to call into the Council Mr. Vankoughnet, who should be allowed to take charge of a Department, and be virtually in the Government without holding a seat, and that they should return to their seats without having been approved of by the country. (Hear, hear.) Nobody respected Mr. Vankoughnet as a professional man more than he did, but he would ask, as a mere question of Constitutional Law and practice, whether the House was to tolerate that state of things just as they existed at present.⁶⁵

MR. PATRICK was glad to hear the late Attorney General East vindicate his character; for on Friday night certain very invidious remarks had been made with regard to the conduct of a member of the late Government, and certainly the modified tone of the late Attorney General East's remarks that evening had a tendency to excite suspicion. It seemed rather extraordinary that that hon. gentleman should have been first so severe on his late colleagues, that he should shortly afterwards speak in such modified terms, and finally absent himself during the vote. All that had however been explained, and⁶⁶ he (Mr. P.) had no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Drummond) was actuated by high principle in not voting, as to which he fully exonerated him.⁶⁷ The Solicitor General [West] seemed to think a great deal of the right of the Government to vote their retention of office.⁶⁸ [That gentleman] had asked, "Shall not the Government vote — have we not a right to do so — why are we here?" Now he would remind hon. members that there was a rule of the House which prevents any private member of the house voting upon any question in which he might personally be interested; and should the present members of the Government, who were to stand before the country as the very models of all that is excellent be permitted to violate that rule? (Hear, hear!)⁶⁹

A Member. — In the way of common sense. (Laughter).⁷⁰

MR. PATRICK. — Yes. "A common sense Government." (Laughter.) Were they going to vote upon a matter in which they are more specially interested than any other persons, and yet they sit here to ignore that very rule of the house. (Hear, hear.) He must say that those gentlemen, in vacating their seats and afterwards presenting themselves before the house as the model Government, had certainly cast upon the house, and Upper Canada in particular, the greatest insult that it ever received. The Solicitor General West had said, that he did not care who carried out the measures, and that as long as a measure is good he would be able to carry it through. Those who had known that gentleman for years, knew that in the former administration, when he was in Quebec, that upon every single measure he was voted against, and that the Government was then carried on in spite of the most factious opposition. The declaration of that hon. gentleman was very out of place.⁷¹

MR. LORANGER. — Many wished to say that the ex-Attorney General East was fully exonerated from having taken any bait.⁷²

MR. TURCOTTE insisted that the Administration were bound to state in what sense they accepted the vote of want of confidence on the former occasion, and did not now; and whether they intended to hold office, and carry on the business of the house. He did not think that the Administration had a right to proceed upon so dangerous a principle as that which was sought to be obtained. He did not agree with the ex-Attorney General East, in the severe remarks that he had made upon the Administration, unless he meant them to apply simply to the Lower Canada section; for he could tell him that that section enjoyed the confidence of the house, which was sustained by a very strong party from Lower Canada. He wished the house to understand that the Attorney General East had a great many friends in Lower Canada, but he doubted whether, by himself, separated from the Lower Canadians, the ex-Attorney General had any such influence as he had claimed; and if he thought that he was competent alone to form a Lower Canada party, he was most seriously mistaken. It was reported that the ex-Attorney General East had given several names to the ministers to fill certain vacant places in which he (Mr. Turcotte) had the honour to figure.⁷³

MR. DRUMMOND said he spoke of the whole Administration as it is at present.⁷⁴

MR. TURCOTTE insisted that the hon. gentleman should say whether the remarks applied to that portion of the Administration which was sustained by a vote of 29 [sic], for if he did he made a great mistake. He agreed with him that it was proper to sustain the Administration in carrying through their measures, but that it would become necessary, after a reasonable time, that the Upper Canada section of the Administration should declare whether they intended to hold office, and how they intended to proceed generally.⁷⁵

MR. BELLINGHAM said there was a French proverb that those who excuse themselves, accuse themselves. — Now, he desired to set himself right with the country.⁷⁶ It would be recollected that when he addressed the house since his re-election, he stated that any ministry deserved to be impeached if it extended any further aid to the Grand Trunk Railroad under the present management. He was then of that opinion and was now. He had been charged by the press with having openly sold himself to the Government. (Hear, hear.) It was not the first attempt that had been made to misrepresent him, and where he had been personally attacked. He had been informed that a notice of motion was to be put down for demanding what emoluments he had received from the Government, and the hon. member for Lambton had alluded to him as being a person steeped in corruption. He had put himself in communication with that hon. gentleman and pointed out to him that he was in error, and he [Mr. Brown] promised him that he would in this house declare his regret for having made use of the language⁷⁷, but had not done so.⁷⁸ While the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Drummond) was a member of the Government, he (Mr. B.) promised him his allegiance. When the Government was formed he asked him (Mr. B.)

if he was inclined to support the administration of which he was a member, to which he acquiesced. He (Mr. B.) would appeal to that hon. gentleman as to his having sought or obtained any personal favour from the administration. He (Mr. B.) might be guilty of errors like any other hon. gentleman, but he had endeavoured to discharge his duties independently, — (hear, hear) — and he defied any hon. member of the ministry to cite a case in which he had received such personal favours.⁷⁹

MR. BROWN said that on the occasion referred to, he made some allusion to the commissionership of the St. Lawrence, at the same time alluding to that hon. member, and he was happy now to state that that statement was groundless.⁸⁰ [But he] could not discharge the hon. gentleman so readily as he would desire with regard to what took place on Friday night last, when the vote was taken on the Want of Confidence Motion, on which occasion the hon. gentleman crossed over the floor and said “Why don’t some of you ask the Government if they intend to give any further aid to the Grand Trunk.”⁸¹ If they do so I will vote against them.”⁸² He (Mr. B.) replied that there was no occasion to ask it, and he (Mr. Bellingham) then went over to the Government, walked off with the Attorney General, went into a neighbouring room, and in two minutes after came out and gave his vote in favour of the Government, while it was well known all the time that the Government intended to give aid to the Grand Trunk, whereas he (Mr. Bellingham) had expressed himself opposed to it.⁸³

MR. GAMBLE deprecated the course of the Government in attempting to proceed with the business of the country, after they had lost the confidence of the House. It seemed to him that the House had forgot its own dignity if it allowed men to retain [their seats] twice under such circumstances.⁸⁴ [He] did not doubt that a large number of the house wanted to proceed with the business of the country, but they had a higher duty than that to perform. Before they took up measures for consideration, it was necessary that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches should state what course they intended to pursue. It was their duty first to have resigned.⁸⁵

MR. ROBINSON wished it to be borne in mind that the Cabinet was not yet completed. (Hear, hear.) The members for Stanstead (Mr. Terrill) and Niagara (Mr. Morrison) had not returned.⁸⁶ [He] thought the hon. gentleman ought not to condemn the Government before some of the members had taken their seats, or their policy had been defined. He did not know what measures they proposed to adopt —⁸⁷

A Member. — Nor care either⁸⁸.

[MR. ROBINSON] hoped the Government would at least be allowed fair play.⁸⁹ But some measures should be disposed of before the House broke up. The Inspector General had declared what the Government meant to do as to the Grand Trunk, and had said “that there was no longer a question of extending aid to the Company but to fulfil the engagements of the Province.” The hon. gentleman then read letters approving of the sentiments set forth by the Inspector General on the matter. It was necessary that something definite should be done for that Company; and it was for the interests of the country that it should be attended to without delay, and that the public business should be gone through before adjourning.⁹⁰

MR. A. DORION considered the course of the hon. member for Simcoe most extraordinary, in alluding to the Inspector General’s language. It was quite out of place.⁹¹ The Inspector General had merely stated that the interest of the Grand Trunk debentures ought to be paid; and that this course was approved of in England. Was this his policy? Is this the policy that is coming before the House? He should like to know what the Government intended to do?⁹² Did anybody know what the Governmental policy upon this Company’s affairs was, but the hon. member for Argenteuil [sic] (Mr. Bellingham)? No.⁹³ The honorable member for Argenteuil has been informed, it appears, in a private manner,⁹⁴ that

the Grand Trunk Company was to be under a different management. What management? That the Road should be taken out of the hands of the Company, or from the control of the contractors, or that other than Government Directors should be appointed. And although the House was denied all knowledge of the precise course of action of the Government on the subject, the hon. member for Argenteuil was to be possessor of it⁹⁵. The remarks of the member for Simcoe were very extraordinary, when he stated that the House would not be right in asking to know the policy of the Government until some members, who at present were without seats in the House, were elected to fill up the ranks of the Ministry. Among the extraordinary speeches made lately, he might mention that by Mr. Drummond. That gentleman stated that the Government had to adopt either of two positions: either to resign at once, or appeal to the indulgence of the House, to enable them to carry through certain measures, and resign at the close of the Session. Is the House to be told after the Ministry have been defeated — they themselves acknowledging that they were defeated — that they are now going to carry on the business of the country?⁹⁶ The present Ministry stood in a most ridiculous position. No ministry would dare to pursue such a course in England, and he did not see why this principle should not be carried out here. It is the duty of the Administration to throw itself upon the indulgence of the house to carry out those measures, which could not be postponed without injury to the country, and then to come down and ask for a dissolution. He maintained that the ministry was not in a position, however, to ask for a dissolution [sic]. They had made their conditions, and they should have dissolved on the first vote. They wanted to postpone the difficulty; and, instead of appealing to the country, they tried to reconstruct the cabinet. They were again beaten, and they may go on and do the same thing again and again, and how long could that continue?⁹⁷ They may probably say that they will not resign. Is the House always to be told that they will not resign, notwithstanding that the majority of the House is against them. Even supposing that they get the assistance of those gentlemen, who have not yet found seats in the House, are the same men that have been beaten before, to come down with the additional couple of members, and hold on to their seats. Such a proceeding was unconstitutional.⁹⁸ If they considered that they could carry on the business with their present majority, why did they ask the opposition to help them? When once the opposition has made up its mind that the Administration cannot carry on the business of the country, it is their duty to do all in their power to oust them. They had proved that they can do so; but the fact is that the Administration is so weak that they do not dare to tell the house that they will dissolve. (Hear, hear.)⁹⁹ Will the ministry attempt to carry on the business of the country in their present state when they would require a much stronger majority to enable them to do so? Will they dare, in the face of so strong an opposition, to carry on their measures? They know perfectly well that they cannot do so; and yet they have not the courage to let those measures drop. If, for instance, they lose the Grand Trunk measure, or the Seat of Government, or the North Shore Railroad scheme, they will also lose several votes with each of these measures. At present, the ministry dare not carry on the business of the House, and it is most important that the House should know what the ministry intended to do, and what measures they propose to carry out. Before he moved for the last vote of want of confidence in the ministry, he had discussed the question with several gentlemen, and they recommended him to postpone his motion for a short time and that then he would get a much larger majority than he did get. But he told those gentlemen that he could not do so, as his motion was not a party vote. He knew that he could have got a much larger majority than he did, if he had waited until members had got from the Government all that they required in the shape of passing their bills, but as his was not a party motion he could not consent to delay it. And since that vote had been recorded the changes that had taken place were not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution of the country. However willing he would be to assist the Administration to pass their measures, that were absolutely necessary, he would tell them that they could not pass those measures; and the best thing that they could do would be to come down to the House and ask its indulgence to pass those measures, at the same time promising to go to the country at the end of the present session.¹⁰⁰ There were some measures that must be gone on with, but there were many others that were not of that character. No one would desire to stop the supplies, and all admitted that something must be done with the

Grand Trunk railway¹⁰¹, and of course something should be done. It was one of those measures that should be taken up at once.¹⁰²

Some discussion ensued as to the question before the House.¹⁰³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER begged to submit whether sufficient time had not been given for this discussion, there being no motion before the chair.¹⁰⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said, the anannouncement [sic] he had made was this: The Government would ask the House to go on with the business of the country. It was the unanimously expressed opinion of the House, during the last wearisome debate on the motion of the member for Montreal, that the business should go on. The question now asked of the Government was whether they intended to resign, or to dissolve the House? If it had intended to resign, it would have done so before now; but it would be decidedly unconstitutional to inform the House that it would be dissolved, while it is still in session.¹⁰⁵ The moment an announcement is made that there is to be a dissolution, that moment the business must cease, as no house can go on with such a threat as a dissolution hanging over it. The Government, then, asks the house to go on with those great measures which are waiting for progress, and throws on the Opposition the responsibility of delaying the necessary business of the country.¹⁰⁶

SIR A. MACNAB thought the Attorney General was wrong on the constitutional point he advanced. He thought it would be found, that when the Melbourne Administration was defeated¹⁰⁷ in 1841¹⁰⁸ by a majority of one, Sir Robert Peel asked whether it was the intention of the Administration to dissolve the house — and they said it was — and they did go on for a fortnight, passed the supplies, and some others of the most important measures. The same thing happened to the Derby Administration.¹⁰⁹ When they found the general sense of the House was against them, they informed the House that a dissolution should forthwith take place. Lord John Russell immediately got up and requested his friends to offer no further opposition but to pass the supplies and the other necessary measures upon the consideration that at the proper time a dissolution would take place. He [Sir Allan] merely mentioned this that the hon. gentlemen might take the necessary steps to inform the House as to their arrangements. He was most anxious that the business of the House should not stand unfinished. He hoped the House would at once grant the supplies upon a proper understanding with the Government, then immediately after that they will dissolve the House and appeal to the country. The Opposition have decidedly a right to put the question. (Hear, hear.) They have a right to ask whether the Government will advise His Excellency to do so.¹¹⁰ But he did not think it right that they should take up the time of the house with factious opposition, and repeated votes of want of confidence. Such a course can only damage the Opposition with the country, instead of benefitting it. He conceived that the proper course for the Ministry would be to give some intimation as to what course they intend to adopt.¹¹¹ In the peculiar circumstances of the case the Government ought to say that so soon as the supplies were passed and the other pressing measures completed the House would be dissolved.¹¹² Surely, if they are left in a minority of six in Upper Canada, and imagine that to be a sufficient reason for resigning, though they had a majority of 23 in the whole house, they cannot think of going on with the business of the country, with an Upper Canada majority of 15 against them, and a majority of 4 only in the whole house. He could not understand how it was possible for them to establish a precedent one way one day, and another way the next.¹¹³ The Government [ought] at once to bring down their measures and let the House know exactly what they meant to do.¹¹⁴ It would be much better to have an understanding with the Government, and appeal to the people.¹¹⁵

MR. J.S. MACDONALD spoke in reference to Mr. Holton's motion, which should have appeared in the orders of the day, and he held that he was in a position to move it now.¹¹⁶

After some further conversation the matter dropped.¹¹⁷

MR. MACKENZIE moved that, after 31st Jan., 1857, or the end of the next fiscal year, there shall be but one currency or money of account, of which the dollar shall be the highest and principal unit; that the public accounts shall be kept in dollars, cents, and mills; and that the intrinsic value be equal to that of the United States.¹¹⁸ The hon. gentleman entered into a full detail of the advantages of the proposed system, as also of the various eminent mercantile and scientific gentlemen in the old country. He moved his motion with the insertion of the words to come in force at the close of that year.¹¹⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD reminded the hon. mover that the decimal system of coinage had been promised, and they were only awaiting the result of the committee now sitting in England on this important subject.¹²⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY asked the member for Haldimand not to press his motion, as there was a Committee of the House of Commons sitting to consider the question of a decimal currency, and it will be well to wait for the result of their deliberations.¹²¹

MR. MACKENZIE declined to wait any longer. He maintained that all the banks in the country were in favor of a change in the present system; public opinion also was strongly in favor of a decimal currency. A committee had already been appointed by Her Majesty, and had reported in favor of the proposed system. The only opposition that had been offered to the proposed system was that shown by the gentlemen on the ministerial side of the House, who made it a point to oppose all measures that were calculated to benefit the country.¹²²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY regretted that the hon. member had not acceded [sic] to the proposition made to him. It was very clear that the House was in favor of a decimal currency, and the only question was to select the best system. He did not think that the House should anticipate the decision of the Imperial Parliament on this question. He would therefore move in amendment, that the orders of the day be now gone on with.¹²³

MR. BROWN did not think that the last speaker had spoken to the point at all. That gentleman had stated that the House should wait for another year to hear the decision of the Imperial Government. He would tell the House that they had been told the same thing year after year, for a long time past. He was aware of the fact. There was a strong public feeling, for decimal currency, and it was no argument that the country should wait to hear the report of a committee. First, the Government took up one ground, in relation to this subject, and they were forced to quit it, then they adopted another, and promised the decimal system, and he was sorry that his hon. friend, Mr. McKenzie, had not agreed to it at once.¹²⁴

MR. MACKENZIE was quite willing to adopt it now.¹²⁵

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD hoped that the House would wait until the committee in the old country had reported; which he hoped they would do in a short time. It would be better to wait its decision than to adopt the American system.¹²⁶

MR. [A. OR J.] DORION did not see the necessity of waiting for the report of the English committee. The business transactions of this country was [sic] increasing every day with the United States, and was [sic] at present very large, far larger than our transactions with England. Therefore it did not concern this country much what they adopted in England. The motion of the hon. member for Haldimand should be adopted at once, especially as it has been admitted to be a good one.¹²⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that if there was one question more than that the people of this country desired to see settled, it was the present one. The people anxiously desired the change, and there was no reason why they should wait on the report of the committee now sitting in England.¹²⁸

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER now left the chair at six o'clock.¹²⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the chair shortly before 8 o'clock.¹³⁰

Upon the question whether the orders of the day be read,¹³¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD expressed his astonishment that the ministry should thus stifle all the efforts of the hon. member for Haldimand to give information to the country, which he as chairman of the committee had obtained on a question of so much importance [sic]. He thought it a poor compliment to a veteran like the hon. member for Haldimand to make a motion to give the go by to a question like this, simply upon the consideration that the Government was not prepared to go into it. They say they are not prepared — but when will they be prepared — they say they must wait the action of England. It certainly was a strange procedure that they should thus deprive the country of the information which had been prepared by the hon. member for Haldimand.¹³²

MR. MACKENZIE said that some members of the House did not seem clearly to understand the question before the House. The legal currency of this country at present is dollars, cents and mills. It was agreed to by the Legislature and England gave her assent to this currency, being the currency of Canada. He proposed no change whatever. The committee of accounts to whom that matter was referred in 1854, simply propose — that as nearly all persons engaged in commerce in the country desire that of the two kinds of currency now legal in Canada, the public accounts should be kept in the currency of dollars and cents. Wherever the opinion of persons in public departments throughout the country has been asked, it has been uniformly in favor of that system. At the request of the Government twelve months ago he stayed his motion as they asked time to consider it — promising that after consideration they would allow the motion to go on. He would remind the House that they were legislating for the commerce of their own country, and as all their bankers have stated their desire to use this system, and as the Boards of Trade in Quebec and Montreal and other places have begged the House to provide that the public accounts may be kept in dollars and cents, he could not see why the House should reject his motion.¹³³

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said the hon. gentleman must have seen during the debate, that the House was not prepared to adopt the principle.¹³⁴

MR. MACKENZIE. — Vote it down then —¹³⁵

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — There is no necessity for voting it down. It was better to wait the action of the English Legislature than all at once to adopt the American system and have afterwards to change it.¹³⁶

MR. MACKENZIE. — You have already adopted it.¹³⁷

Mr. Cayley's motion was then put¹³⁸.

(558)

Mr. Mackenzie moved, seconded by Mr. Foley, and the Question being proposed, That from and after the 31st day of January, 1857, or at the close of the present fiscal year, the Public Accounts shall be kept in Dollars, Cents, and Mills;

(559)

The Honorable Mr. Cayley moved, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith, and the Question being put, That the Orders of the day be now read; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Alley, Bellingham, Bowes, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cayley, Chapais, Conger, Cryser, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Thomas Fortier, Fournier,

Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Marchildon, Matheson, Meagher, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Supple, Taché, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding. — (42.)

NAYS.

Messieurs Bell, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Felton, Foley, Hartman, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Merritt, Papin, Patrick, Prévost, Rhodes, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Southwick, and Wilson. — (26.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

And the Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to enable the Standing Committees on Private Bills of the Legislative Council and Assembly to examine Witnesses on Oath, being read;

In the absence of Hon. Mr. Cameron, MR. HARTMAN moved the second reading of the bill¹³⁹.

MR. MERRITT opposed the Bill.¹⁴⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD was somewhat doubtful of the propriety of introducing this novel principle, and suggested that the Bill, after being read a second time, should be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges.¹⁴¹

MR. ALLEYN was opposed to the Bill *in toto*. He considered that the tendency of the age was rather to substitute affirmations for oaths, than to impose additional oaths.¹⁴²

After a good deal of discussion, the Attorney General's suggestion was acceded to¹⁴³.

(559) The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

[On motion of] MR. WILSON¹⁴⁴,

(559) The House, according to Order, resumed the further consideration of the Question, That the Bill (to incorporate a Company to construct a Railway from the City of *London* to intersect the Grand Trunk Railway at *St. Mary's*, or at some point north of *London*) do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to incorporate the *London* and Grand Trunk Junction Railway Company;"

MR. BROWN objected to the motion¹⁴⁵. There was a power in the Bill which enables the Company to incorporate itself with the Grand Trunk or any other Company. This amalgamation principle was a very objectionable one, and had produced many of those evils under which the Grand Trunk Road now was suffering.¹⁴⁶ The object of the bill was to enable the Grand Trunk Company to deviate from their original contract. This bill he admitted did not in so many words say they would deviate from that contract; but as the people of Toronto had taken £100,000 of stock in that line upon condition that the line should extend to Sarnia, and by passing this bill it gave them the power to deviate from their contract.¹⁴⁷ He moved the following as an Amendment: — "That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to strike out the clause authorizing the amalgamation of the London and St. Mary's Railroad with the Grand Trunk."¹⁴⁸

MR. WILSON said it was absurd to expect that a road of the length of the Ste [sic] Mary's could pay without some amalgamation. He could not see that it affected the Grand Trunk at all.¹⁴⁹

MR. BOWES explained that the objection to this clause was, that it would enable the Grand Trunk to get out of their contract with the Toronto and Guelph Company, which was, that they should continue that road to Sarnia¹⁵⁰. It was his duty as one of the representatives of the City of Toronto to vote for the motion before the House, inasmuch as¹⁵¹ the city of Toronto had got £100,000 on that road, [and] in order to make that stock pay, it would be necessary for them to insist upon the Grand Trunk continuing their road to Sarnia, and they were now about putting the matter into Chancery to compel that company to make their road to Sarnia.¹⁵²

The amendment was then put, and lost on a division.¹⁵³

(559)

Mr. *Brown* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *James Smith*, That all the words after "Bill" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "be amended by leaving out the Clause authorizing the amalgamation of the said *London* and *St. Mary's* Railroad with the Grand Trunk Railway" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: — And it passed in the Negative.

MR. J. SMITH moved in amendment, the postponement of the bill for another week, in order to enable the House to see the proposition of the Government in regard to the Grand Trunk.¹⁵⁴

MR. J.S. MACDONALD did not see any thing unreasonable in the request. He understood the Government was to come down with their proposition on Wednesday evening. (Wednesday is a holiday.) He understood they had stated they were prepared to come down on Wednesday.¹⁵⁵

MR. BROWN supported the motion.¹⁵⁶

MR. PATRICK said that allowing this road to be built would not relieve the Grand Trunk from the necessity of completing the road to Sarnia, and, as far as the Great Western was concerned, it had already more than it could do.¹⁵⁷

After some further discussion, the amendment was put and lost on a division.¹⁵⁸

(559)

And the Question being again proposed, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to incorporate the *London* and Grand Trunk Junction Railway Company;"

Mr. *James Smith* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *Brown*, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "the further consideration of the Bill to be postponed until Monday next" inserted instead thereof;

(560)

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: — And it passed in the Negative.

Then the main Question being put; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Biggar, Bureau, Burton, Attorney General Cartier, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Conger, Crysler, Desaulniers, Dionne, Antoine A. Dorion, Drummond, Evanturel, Foley, Thomas Fortier, Fournier, Freeman, Gamble, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Masson, Mattice, Meagher, Merritt, Mongenais, Papin, Patrick, Poulin, Pouliot, Rhodes, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, James Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Wilson, and Yeilding.* — (54.)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Bourassa, Bowes, Brown, Christie, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Dufresne, Gould, Jobin, Lumsden, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Munro, and James Smith.* — (15.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Ordered, That Mr. *Wilson* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

The Order of the day for the third reading of the Bill to amend and consolidate the several Acts incorporating and relating to the Bank of *Montreal*, being read;

Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* moved, seconded by Mr. *Wilson*, and the Question being proposed, That the Bill be now read the third time;

At the request of MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH,¹⁵⁹

The Clerk read the clauses of the bill which had been amended.¹⁶⁰

MR. MERRITT suggested the propriety of refer[r]ing the Bill back to the committee to harmonize its provisions with more of their Bills already passed by the House.¹⁶¹

MR. LORANGER moved that this Bill be to require Banks to redeem their notes at par we [sic] substituted instead of this, Bills we [sic] ordered to establish the principle upon which these Banks should operate.¹⁶²

MR. MACKENZIE opposed the Bill, and complained that there were no clauses in it to protect the public.¹⁶³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY, and MESSRS. ALLEYN and GAMBLE, replied to some of the personal attacks made by Mr. Mackenzie.¹⁶⁴

MR. MACKENZIE moved an amendment, "that the order for the third reading be discharged, and the Bill be referred to a committee of the whole house forthwith, for the purpose of striking out of the clause 22 so much of its provisions as authorizes or legalizes usury or extortion in the form of half per cent. on notes, bills, or other negotiable paper or securities."¹⁶⁵

MR. SANBORN supported the motion¹⁶⁶.

(560)

Mr. *Mackenzie* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *Sanborn*, That all the words after "now" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "recommitted to a Committee of the whole House for the purpose of leaving out of the 22nd Clause so much of its provisions as authorizes and legalizes usury or extortion in the form of a half per cent. special charge on certain notes, bills, or other negotiable paper or securities" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Biggar, Bourassa, Bureau, Cauchon, Chapais, Charles Daoust, Darche, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Fournier, Freeman, Mackenzie, McCann, Meagher, Munro, Polette, Pouliot, Sanborn, Solicitor General Smith, and Thibaudeau*. — (21.)

(560-561)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Bell, Bellingham, Brown, Attorney General Cartier, Cayley, Conger, Crysler, Antoine A. Dorion, Drummond, Dufresne, Gamble, Jobin, Larwill, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Marchildon, Masson, Mattice, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, Papin, Poulin, Rhodes, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Spence, Stevenson, Turcotte, Wilson, and Yeilding*. — (31.)

(561)

So it passed in the Negative.

Then the main Question being put;

Ordered, That the Bill be now read the third time.

The Bill was accordingly read the third time.

MR. CONGER, to the motion that the Bill pass, moved an amendment, that all that part of the 22nd clause, authorizing the banks to charge $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. be struck out, and the following inserted, that the banks may charge on all notes and bills of one month $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent., of two months $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, of 3 months $\frac{3}{8}$ per cent, of four months $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, of six months $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, on the amount of every such note, bill, or other negotiable paper, to defray the expenses of agency and collection.¹⁶⁷

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH advised the member for Peterboro' to withdraw his motion. It was evident that the sense of the house was opposed to any alteration of the bill.¹⁶⁸

MR. CONGER consented to withdraw it.¹⁶⁹

MR. MACKENZIE moved an amendment — to add to the 29th section the following words “each month a statement of the assets and liabilities of the bank be given under oath of the President and Cashier of the bank.”¹⁷⁰

(561)

Mr. *Mackenzie* moved, seconded by Mr. *Sanborn*, and the Question being put, That the words “such monthly and other statements of the Assets and Liabilities of the Bank shall be given under oath, by the President and Cashier of the Bank” be added at the end of the 29th Clause of the Bill; the House divided: — And it passed in the Negative.

MR. A. DORION moved an amendment to the 24th clause, by striking out the words “where they shall issue”, and inserting in lieu thereof the words — “the place where they bear date.”¹⁷¹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD supported the amendment, and said the effect of the clause as it stood in the Bill would be to shut up all the agencies.¹⁷²

(561)

Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* moved, seconded by Mr. *Gamble*, and the Question being put, That the 24th Clause of the Bill be amended, by leaving out the words “where they shall be issued, and all such notes and bills shall bear date at the place where they are issued” after the word “place” in the fifth line, and inserting the words “where they bear date” instead thereof; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Bowes*, *Brown*, *Bureau*, Attorney General *Cartier*, *Cayley*, *Conger*, *Crysler*, *Desaulniers*, *Dionne*, *Antoine A. Dorion*, *Dostaler*, *Drummond*, *Dufresne*, *Octave C. Fortier*, *Fournier*, *Gamble*, *Laporte*, *Larwill*, *Lemieux*, *Loranger*, *Macbeth*, Attorney General *Macdonald*, *McCann*, *Masson*, *Matheson*, *Mattice*, *Mongenais*, *Polette*, *Poulin*, *Pouliot*, *Rhodes*, *Robinson*, Solicitor General *Ross*, *Spence*, *Thibaudeau*, and *Turcotte*. — (36.)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Aikins*, *Bell*, *Christie*, *Jean B.E. Dorion*, *Foley*, *Freeman*, *Hartman*, *Mackenzie*, *Munro*, *Papin*, *Sanborn*, and Solicitor General *Smith*. — (12.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* moved, seconded by Mr. *Gamble*, and the Question being put, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, “An Act to amend and consolidate the several Acts incorporating and relating to the Bank of *Montreal*,” the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins*, *Bowes*, *Brown*, *Bureau*, Attorney General *Cartier*, *Cayley*, *Christie*, *Conger*, *Crysler*, *Desaulniers*, *Jean B.E. Dorion*, *Antoine A. Dorion*, *Dostaler*, *Drummond*, *Dufresne*, *Foley*, *Octave C. Fortier*, *Freeman*, *Gamble*, *Hartman*, *Laporte*, *Larwill*, *Lemieux*, *Loranger*, *Macbeth*, Attorney General *Macdonald*, *McCann*, *Masson*, *Matheson*, *Mattice*, *Mongenais*, *Papin*, *Polette*, *Poulin*, *Rhodes*, *Robinson*, Solicitor General *Ross*, *Sanborn*, Solicitor General *Smith*, *Spence*, *Thibaudeau*, and *Turcotte*. — (42.)

(562)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Bell*, and *Mackenzie*. — (2.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Ordered, That Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

The House, according to Order, resumed the further consideration of the Bill to amend the Act 16 *Vic. cap. 13*, intituled, "An Act to provide for the better organization of Agricultural Societies in *Lower Canada*, and for other purposes connected with Agriculture in *Upper* and *Lower Canada*."

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Ross*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*,

Ordered, That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House for the purpose of further amending the same.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the said Committee.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee;

MR. MACKENZIE opposed the bill as he considered its whole object was to give money to a number of Agricultural Societies.¹⁷³

Certain amendments suggested by MR. J. DORION and other members [were introduced].¹⁷⁴

The Committee rose and reported the Bill as amended.¹⁷⁵

(562)

and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Masson* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made amendments thereunto.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. *Masson* reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendments were read, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to amend the Act to provide for the better organization of Agricultural Societies in *Lower Canada*, and for other purposes connected with Agriculture in *Upper* and *Lower Canada*."

Ordered, That Mr. Solicitor General *Ross* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

Then, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by Mr. *Bowes*,
The House adjourned.¹⁷⁶

Footnotes

1. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
2. *Globe*, 3 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, notes that "a short discussion ensued as to the propriety of taking this bill up before the second reading of the other bank bills was proceeded with. It was also objected to, Monday being set apart for the notices of motion."
3. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
4. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
5. *Montreal Gazette*, 5 June 1856.
6. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
7. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
8. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.

11. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
12. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. The debate is inserted at this point in the proceedings according to the information provided in the reports of *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, and *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
13. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
14. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
15. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
16. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
18. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
19. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
20. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
22. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
23. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. In a commentary, *Globe*, 3 June 1856, reports that "this announcement was received with ironical cheers by the Opposition".
24. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
25. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
26. *Montreal Gazette*, 5 June 1856.
27. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
28. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
30. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. This newspaper mistakenly identifies the member speaking as Mr. J.A. Macdonald.
31. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
32. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
33. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
34. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
35. *Montreal Gazette*, 5 June 1856.
36. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Pilot*, 7 June 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
42. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
43. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
44. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
45. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
46. *Globe*, 3 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, reports that Mr. Drummond replied to Mr. Mackenzie "with great indignation".
47. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
48. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
49. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
50. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
51. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
52. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
53. *Globe*, 3 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, reports this statement in the following manner: "Let them dissolve the House when the great measures now before them shall have been disposed of and then Hon. Gentlemen from Lower Canada can go back to their constituents and ask their opinion as to whether it was right their representatives [sic] should be put in their present ridiculous position, can go back to their constituents and to be in fact laughed at."
54. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
57. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
58. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
59. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
60. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.

61. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
62. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. *Montreal Transcript*, 7 June 1856, reports a commentary regarding Mr. Drummond's explanations.
63. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
64. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
65. *Montreal Gazette*, 5 June 1856.
66. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
67. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
69. *Montreal Gazette*, 5 June 1856.
70. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Ibid.*
76. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
77. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
78. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
79. *Globe*, 3 June 1856. In a commentary, *Montreal Transcript*, 7 June 1856, makes some remarks regarding Mr. Bellingham.
80. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
81. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
82. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
83. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
84. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
85. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
86. *Ibid.*
87. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Ibid.*
90. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
93. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
95. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
96. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
97. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
98. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
99. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
100. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
101. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
102. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
103. *Ibid.*
104. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
105. *Globe*, 3 June 1856. In a commentary, this newspaper also reports that Mr. J.A. Macdonald said "it would be unconstitutional for the Government to announce a dissolution before the House was actually sent about its business". *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, however, reports the following statement: "It had been asked by several members was it the intention of the Government to resign or not? It would be unconstitutional for the Government to say what they would do if they had not the confidence of the house." It also reports in a commentary that this gentleman "enunciated the somewhat extraordinary doctrine, that for the Ministry to announce their intention, at the present stage of their career, either to resign or go to the country, would be a course at variance with all constitutional practice."
106. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
107. *Ibid.*
108. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
109. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.

110. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
111. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
112. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
113. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
114. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
115. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
116. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
117. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. Commentaries on this debate are reported in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, *Globe*, 3 June 1856, and *Le Pays*, 7 June 1856.
118. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
119. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
120. *Ibid.*
121. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
122. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
123. *Ibid.*
124. *Ibid.*
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Ibid.*
127. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. Neither this newspaper nor *Globe*, 3 June 1856, specifies whether the speaker was Mr. A. Dorion or Mr. J. Dorion.
128. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
129. *Ibid.*
130. *Ibid.*
131. *Ibid.*
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*
134. *Ibid.*
135. *Ibid.*
136. *Ibid.*
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Ibid.*
139. *Ibid.*
140. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
141. *Ibid.*
142. *Ibid.*
143. *Ibid.*
144. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
145. *Ibid.*
146. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
147. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
148. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
149. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
150. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
151. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
152. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
153. *Ibid.*
154. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Ibid.*
157. *Globe*, 3 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, mentions that "Mr. Patrick, and others opposed" the motion.
158. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.
159. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.
160. *Ibid.*
161. *Ibid.*
162. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856. This is the only account that reports such information on a motion by Mr. Loranger. In addition to its poor grammar, it does not specify whether the motion was withdrawn or not. On 3 June 1856, however,

Mr. Loranger proposed a similar motion in amendment to the third reading of the Union Bank of Upper Canada (see p. 2365).

163. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.

164. *Ibid.*

165. *Ibid.*

166. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.

167. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.

168. *Ibid.*

169. *Ibid.*

170. *Ibid.*

171. *Ibid.*

172. *Ibid.*

173. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856.

174. *Globe*, 3 June 1856.

175. *Ibid.*

176. *Globe*, 3 June 1856, and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 3 June 1856, both report that the House adjourned "at twelve o'clock".

TUESDAY, 3 JUNE 1856

(562)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*, — The Petition of *William Sykes*, of the City of *Toronto*.

By Mr. *Gould*, — The Petition of *J.K. Vernon* and others, of the Township of *Scott*.

By the Honorable Mr. *Lemieux*, — The Petition of Messieurs *Benson* and Company, and others, of the Counties of *Levis* and *Dorchester*, and other places.

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH moved that when this House adjourns on Thursday, [and] Friday..., it stand adjourned untill the following mornings at ten o'clock; and that the House do not sit longer than 3 o'clock P.M., on Saturday.¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that while members on his side of the house were willing to allow the business to be expedited as fast as possible, they expected that after the declarations made yesterday,² the Government ... [would have] come down to the House with that declaration of their policy and principles, which was expected of them by the House and the country, and without which they could not expect to carry on the business of the country. That declaration was³ waited for not by the Opposition, but by their friends with great anxiety, and it was due⁴ to their friends and [to] these hon. gentlemen, including the hon. and gallant Knight, and the hon. member for Shefford, who had expressed a wish that they should finish the business of the country, after they had defined their policy. — Would the Government dare to treat the wishes of their friends with scorn and contempt?⁵

DR. T. FORTIER. — Question, question.⁶

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — The hon. member may cry question; and he would say this much for the hon. member for Nicolet that he had been invariably found a most subservient follower of every Administration, he (Mr. Macdonald) could call to mind.⁷

DR. T. FORTIER. — Yes; and I will continue to be so — (loud laughter) — so long as they do good.⁸

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — He had no doubt he would even support the member for Lambton, if he was at the head of a Government. He (Mr. Macdonald) protested against anything being done, until the ministers stated what they intended to do.⁹

DR. T. FORTIER deprecated the attack made on him by the hon. member for Glengary. Unlike that hon. member, he had always been consistent in his policy. He never sought his own aggrandizement by putting the House and the country in a turmoil, nor was he actuated by that grasping ambition which induced the hon. member for Glengary to offer such factious opposition to Government measures, because he did not occupy a seat on the treasury benches. He never adopted the tactics of that hon. gentleman in seeking to create animosity between the two sections of the Province, and then clamoring for annexation. He hoped that the member would not again indulge in such an attack of him.¹⁰

MR. A. DORION said that the first motion to establish morning sittings had been made by Mr. Galt.¹¹ [He] regretted that the Government had last night opposed his motion to go through the orders of the day and then take up the unopposed bills. If they really desired to proceed with the business of the country, they ought to adopt that course. It had been adopted with success not only last session,

but also during the present session. He hoped therefore, the Government would not continue to oppose it.¹² He was willing to agree to any motion to expedite the business, not abandoning the position taken by the member for Glengary.¹³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said it was not fair to charge the Government with opposing that motion. They neither acceded to it nor yet opposed it; as it seemed to be the universal wish of the House to first get through the unopposed third readings.¹⁴ When the motion of the member for Glengary came up it would be time to speak of explanations.¹⁵

The motion was then agreed to.¹⁶

(562) On motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*,

Resolved, That at the rising of this House on Thursday and Friday next, it stand adjourned until the following mornings at Ten o'clock; and that on Saturday it do adjourn at Three o'clock in the afternoon.

(563) The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*, one of her Majesty's Executive Council, delivered to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by His Excellency.

And the said Message was read by Mr. Speaker, all the Members of the House being uncovered; and is as followeth: —

Edmund Head.

The Governor General recommends to the Legislative Assembly with a view to forward the opening of the Waste Lands of the Crown, that a Grant be made of Twenty-five thousand pounds, one-half to be expended in *Lower Canada*, and the other half in *Upper Canada*.

Government House,

Toronto, 29th May, 1856.¹⁷

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier* also presented, pursuant to Addresses to His Excellency the Governor General, — Return in part to an Address from the Legislative Assembly, dated the 5th ultimo, for a Return giving the names, official title, and amount of annual salary of each individual upon the Permanent Staff connected with the following Departments of the Public Service in this Province, viz: — Executive Council; Civil Secretary's Office; Provincial Secretary's Office; Provincial Registrar's Office; Receiver General's Office; Inspector General's Office, different branches; Crown Lands Department, different branches; Crown Law Offices, East and West; General Post Office Department; Educational Department; Public Works; Indian Department; Legislative Council; Legislative Assembly; Adjutant General's Office; Geological Department; and Bureau of Agriculture.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 60.)

Return to an Address of the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated 28th February, 1856, for Statement of Sale of Seigniories on which *Droit de Quint* was payable, the amount of the said *Droit*, and if not paid, the reason why.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 15.)

Return to an Address of the Legislative Assembly, dated the 5th ultimo, for copies of all Correspondence, Reports, and Orders in Council, in relation to the purchase of certain Beach and Water Lots by *Henry LeMesurier*, *Charles Sharples*, *William Walker*, junior, *Henry Pemberton*, *Denis Bogue*, and others, in the Fief *Sillery*, near *Quebec*.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 61.)

On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY then moved the House into Committee of the whole, to consider of a supply granted to Her Majesty, and of His Excellency's Messages with Estimates and supplementary Estimates, referred.¹⁸

SIR A. MACNAB would oppose the motion on the ground that it was understood the third readings were to have been proceeded with¹⁹.

After a short discussion the house took up the third readings²⁰.

SIR A. MACNAB moved the third reading of the bill to incorporate the Union Bank of Canada.²¹

MR. LORANGER moved in amendment, his bill to require all banks to redeem their notes at par; as this was a general measure for the regulation of all banks.²²

MR. DRUMMOND said there was no reason why this bank should not, like the Montreal Bank, be incorporated. After it had been incorporated, the hon. member's measure, if carried, would be applicable to all.²³

MR. MERRITT thought that immense delay had taken place in consequence of the hon. member for Laprairie's bill not being disposed of.²⁴

MR. LORANGER withdrew his amendment²⁵.

The bill was read a third time and passed.²⁶

MR. MACKENZIE called for the yeas and nays in order to record his name against the passage of the bill.²⁷

[The] motion [was] granted.²⁸

(563) A Bill to incorporate the Union Bank of *Upper Canada*, was, according to Order, read the third time.

The Honorable Sir *Allan N. MacNab* moved, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, and the Question being put, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to incorporate the Union Bank of *Canada*;" the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

(563-564)

YEAS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Biggar, Bourassa, Bowes, Burton*, Attorney General *Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Chabot, Chapais, Christie, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Delong, Desaulniers, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Dostaler, Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Foley, Thomas Fortier, Octave. C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gould, Guévremont, Hartman, Jackson, Jobin, Labelle, Laporte, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, John S. Macdonald, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Masson, Mattice, Meagher, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, Munro, O'Farrell, Papin, Patrick, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Robinson, Rolph, Solicitor General Ross, Sanborn, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Thibaudeau, and Wright. — (73.)*

(564)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Darche, Larwill*, and *Mackenzie*. — (3.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Ordered, That Mr. *Freeman* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH, in absence of Mr. Price²⁹,

(564)

A Bill for the preservation of Salmon in the Rivers *St. Lawrence* and *Saguenay*, and their tributaries, was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act for the protection of the Salmon and Salmon Trout Fisheries in *Lower Canada*."

Ordered, That Mr. *Price* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

The Order of the day for the third reading of the Bill to establish a Circuit Court in and for the County of *Huntingdon*, and part of the County of *Chateaugay*, being read;

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier* moved³⁰, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Lemieux*, and the Question being proposed, That the Bill be now read the third time;

Mr. *Papin* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "it is inexpedient now to create new Circuits, inasmuch as a Bill for the establishment of new Judicial Divisions has been submitted to the House by the Government" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Bourassa, Casault, Christie, Dionne, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Gould, Hartman, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Merritt, Munro, Papin, Poulin, Rolph, and Wright*. — (17.)

(564-565)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bowes, Attorney General Cartier, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, Desaulniers, Jean B.E. Dorion, Drummond, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Guévremont, Jobin, Labelle, Laporte, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Masson, Meagher, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Patrick, Polette, Pouliot, Robinson, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, and Thibaudeau*. — (50.)³¹

(565)

So it passed in the Negative.

Then the main Question being put;

Ordered, That the Bill be now read the third time.

The Bill was accordingly read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "The *Lower Canada* Judicature Amendment Act of 1856."

Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. GAMBLE³²,

(565)

A Bill to incorporate certain persons therein named under the style and title of the Millers' Association of *Canada West*, was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to incorporate the "Millers' Association of *Canada West*."

Ordered, That Mr. *Gamble* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. CHRISTIE³³,

(565)

A Bill to vest a certain Road allowance in *Horace Capron* and *Myron Ames*, was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to vest a certain allowance for Road in the Township of *South Dumfries*, in the County of *Brant*, in *Horace Capron* and *Myron Ames*."

Ordered, That Mr. *Christie* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. ROBINSON³⁴,

(565) A Bill to authorize *Henry Augustus Fitzgerald McLeod* to practise as a Provincial Land Surveyor, was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass.

Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. *Robinson* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. J.S. MACDONALD, in absence of Hon. Mr. Cameron³⁵,

(565) A Bill to amend the Act of Incorporation of the *Woodstock* and Lake *Erie* Railway and Harbour Company, was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass.

Ordered, That the Honorable *John Sandfield Macdonald* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. MERRITT³⁶,

(565) A Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to enable the Churchwardens of *St. George's* Church in the Town of *St. Catharines*, to sell and convey four acres of land originally purchased 'as a site for a parsonage,' and for other purposes," was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass.

(566) *Ordered*, That the Honorable Mr. *Merritt* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath passed the same, without any Amendment.

[On motion of] MR. A. DORION³⁷,

(566) A Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Montreal* to borrow a sum of Fifty thousand pounds, for the purpose of completing the new Water Works in the City of *Montreal*," was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass.

Ordered, That Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath passed the same, without any Amendment.

The Order of the day for the House in Committee of Supply, being read;

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD then moved the House into committee of supply.³⁸

MR. MACKENZIE moved in amendment that the Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that the order be postponed till Friday next. The hon. gentleman said he made this motion because he could not see the propriety of the House going into committee of supply, without any explanation from the Government³⁹. When the Government had declared that they could not continue in office with an Upper Canada majority of six against them, he could not understand how they could go on with the business of the country with a loss of nineteen votes since that time? If their object is merely to get a supply for a Government *pro tempore*, all was well; but if the object is to obtain a vote as if this Government had the confidence of the country, and thus keep their places all the year, then he felt bound to oppose it.⁴⁰

[It] was a monstrous proposition. One thing was clearly settled by the first Parliament held after the Union, and that was the principle of responsible Government — that principle which the present administration now sought to ignore, in order to retain their seats. And when, in accordance with that principle, the present administration had been weighed in the balances and found wanting, then it was clearly the duty of His Excellency either to dissolve the House or select new advisers in the House. Such a course was not adopted, however, and he would therefore feel it his duty to prevent such an administration receiving a vote of supplies from the House.⁴¹

(566)

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald* moved, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, and the Question being proposed, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;

Mr. *Mackenzie* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion*, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "the said Order of the day be postponed until Friday next" inserted instead thereof;

MR. J.S. MACDONALD moved in amendment to that amendment —

"*To Resolve* — That an humble address be presented to his Excellency the Governor General representing that by the gracious permission of her Majesty, conveyed through her Secretary of State for the Colonies, the system of Administration known as Responsible Government was introduced into this Province at the time of the Union between Upper and Lower Canada in 1841.

"That the principle of Responsible Government was embodied in a resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly on the 3rd of September, 1841, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Harrison, the Secretary of the Province, and which received the sanction of the house, and was to the following effect: —

"That in order to preserve between the different branches of the Provincial Parliament that harmony which is essential to the peace, welfare and good government of the Province, the chief advisers of the representatives of the Sovereign constituting a Provincial Administration under him, ought to be men possessed of the confidence of the representatives of the people; thus affording a guarantee that the well understood wishes and interests [sic] of the people, which our gracious Sovereign has declared shall be the rule of the Provincial Government, will on all occasions be faithfully represented and advocated.'

"That in order to ensure the due application of this important constitutional right to the Administration of public affairs in this Province, it is indispensable that the members of the Administration selected to represent either section of this Province, should possess the confidence of that section to which such members belong, and from which they have been chosen.

"That so long as this Province does not possess a Representation based on Population, but is governed by a Legislature, the popular branch of which is chosen in fixed and equal proportions from Upper and Lower Canada; it is the more imperative that each section of the Cabinet should be able to command the confidence of the representatives of the section of the Province, on whose behalf and for whose benefit they have been specially appointed.

"That this just principle has been virtually recognized from the first establishment of Responsible Government, until now, the only exception having been in the case of Lord Metcalfe's Administration, when the Government of the Province was conducted upon principles completely at variance with the well understood wishes of the people of Lower Canada, and in the face of a powerful majority of the representatives from that section of the Province; this proceeding, however, was promptly repudiated and condemned by the people of Canada at the then next general election, and it has not since been attempted to be carried out.

"That upon the occasion of the resignation of the Hon. Robert Baldwin, the Leader of the Upper Canada Section of the Cabinet, in 1851, upon an adverse vote of a majority of the Upper Canadian Representatives, relative to the abolition of the Court of Chancery, and again in 1854, upon the resignation of the Hincks-Morin Administration, this constitutional principle was fully recognised, the Hon. Mr. Hincks stating to the House in reference to his own retirement, that 'I felt that I could not be justified [sic] in

remaining in an Administration with my colleagues from Lower Canada, when I could not command the confidence of the Section of the Province to which I belong.'

"That it was in conformity with this principle that the recent resignation of His Excellency's advisers took place, and any attempt to depart from it would, in the opinion of this house, tend effectually to destroy the legitimate influence hitherto exercised by the Legislature on the Government of this country, and would enable her Majesty's Representative to combine with a minority of this house to compel the adoption of a system of legislation towards one section of the Province utterly at variance with the wants, wishes and interests of the people inhabiting the same.

"That the Upper Canadian Representatives in this house eaving [sic] recently declared by a large majority, their extreme dissatisfaction with the recent changes in the Provincial Administration, this house would respectfully implore his Excellency to call to his counsels such men from both sections of the Province as may be able to form a strong, efficient and united administration, capable of carrying out a policy calculated to develop the resources, and to cherish the best interests of this noble Province, and to set at rest the many questions which await the consideration of a wise and vigorous Government, possessed of the confidence of this house and of the country at large."⁴²

The hon. gentleman said he rose with more pain than anger to make that motion. Nothing but a sense of the duty which he owed to himself and to his country induced him to do so. But he wished to set himself right with reference to this question of the double majority principle, a principle which had guided Parliament ever since the introduction of responsible government. It was to him a matter of much embarrassment that those hon. gentlemen with whom he had acted for the past ten or twelve years — that reform party which had so long stood firm, and resisted the demands of an insolent oligarchy — could now be found supporting an Administration, whose acts were subversive of the best interests of the Province.⁴³ He wished now to ascertain from the vote of this house, whether he and the small band of reformers who had acted with him were right or wrong in upholding the rights and privileges of the people of Lower Canada, when they were trampled on by a contemptible oligarchy. Under the old system a small minority assumed the power of governing this country contrary to the wishes of the majority. That was the case in Upper Canada, and it was equally the case in Lower Canada.⁴⁴ It was only after a mighty effort, which rent the Province from one end of the Province to the other, they freed themselves from the oppression which ground them down, and emerged from the depths of despotism to the safety and freedom of responsible Government. By what party was responsible Government then demanded? By those who now claimed all the loyalty, all the virtue, all the honesty and all the talent for holding office in the country? No! but by the reform party. (Hear, hear.)⁴⁵ In 1841, Mr. Baldwin moved a series of resolutions to which the amendments moved on the part of the Government, by Mr. Harrison, were mere echoes, and one of those amendments would be found in the third paragraph of the address which he [Mr. Macdonald] proposed for adoption. Not long after the adoption of Responsible Government — a vital change which was hailed with gladness and satisfaction from one end of the Province to the other — Messrs. Baldwin and Lafontaine were called into the counsels of the country, and brought to their aid gentlemen who carried with them the confidence of the entire country. So matters went on, until Lord Metcalfe, misunderstanding the genius of the people who had fought so hard for free institutions, raised his single voice in opposition to them, and claimed the right of making appointments⁴⁶ [and] conducting the affairs of the Government as he wished⁴⁷, regardless of the voice of the administration. The administration of the day stood their ground, protested against the act of the Governor, and when that protest failed, retired from the cabinet. In their place, Lord Metcalfe got his willing tools, for there were not wanting men in those days willing to accept office, and sacrifice the wishes of the people of the country. Our Lower Canadian brethren were the subjects of a complete despotism; for months and months the Government was carried on by a single head of a department. Mr. Dominick Daly was the only head of a department who sat in the Council, who obtained a constituency for months; and then Mr. Morris and Mr. Draper accepted office; and finally two or three French Canadians were found willing to sell themselves, and to sell the rights of their countrymen. But the result was that those three gentlemen

were at once consigned to oblivion and obscurity. The Governor was in a dilemma, and it was then that the Inspector General was brought into the Government from the docks of Niagara, when he was wholly without any political reputation, and scarcely known to one-tenth of the people of this province. Shortly after the Attorney General and the Receiver General joined the cabinet of Lord Metcalfe, and it was completed. He need scarcely remind the house how deeply the Reformers of Upper Canada sympathized with their brethren of Lower Canada, at that time.⁴⁸ The Government dragged on a miserable existence for a couple of years. They held on to office, until they were pushed out, and sunk to such a depth of degradation that — as an American senator once said — even the resurrection would not get them up again.⁴⁹ The hon. gentleman then alluded to the inconsistent course that the hon. member for Quebec had pursued in formerly protesting against the despotic rule of Upper Canada crushing their Lower Canadian brethren, and content now to hold himself up as a specimen of the manner in which a Lower Canadian can eat up all his previous words. That gentleman was now associated with hon. gentlemen who declare that they will hold office in spite of the wishes of the people.⁵⁰ In 1848, ... the Baldwin-Lafontaine Administration came into power. Now, he appealed to any hon. gentleman in the House, if, during the whole time the Tory party were in power, they could point to one single measure of theirs which any upright, honest farmer could rejoice at? There was not one. But when the Baldwin-Lafontaine Administration were in office, the case was far different. We, continued the hon. member, can refer to many of the acts of that Administration which prevented party violence — we can refer to amendments of the municipal law — we can refer to the enactment of the Jury Laws, by which Sheriffs were no longer able to pack juries, or stigmatise Grand Juries as partisans — we can refer to the time when cheap law was brought to every man's door — and we can refer to many other great and important measures — the offsprings of that Administration. About the latter end of June, 1851, however, Mr. Baldwin found himself in a minority, on a motion made by the hon. member for Haldimand, and⁵¹ retired from office upon finding that six members from Upper Canada condemned the system which he proposed introducing into the Chancery Courts⁵². With that keen sense of delicacy, which always distinguished that hon. gentleman, he at once resigned, finding the confidence of the country had been withdrawn from him. (Hear, hear.)⁵³ Mr. Hincks at the time expressed the opinion that Mr. Baldwin was justified in the course that he took⁵⁴. The Hincks Administration was subsequently formed, and received the support of both sections of the Province; but in 1854,⁵⁵ finding that the support which he expected from Upper Canada had been withdrawn from him,⁵⁶ the Premier said that seeing the result of the vote on the Speakership, he had made up his mind that it was impossible for him to carry on the Government of the country with satisfaction. Even on the Address from the throne, he could not reckon on a greater majority than two or three. The present Administration would attempt to retain office with a majority of four!⁵⁷ But there never was such apostacy manifested as there was by the Hincks supporters handing themselves over to the tender mercies of the Conservatives. Mr. Hincks then declared that he did not feel himself justified in remaining in an Administration with his colleagues from Lower Canada, when he could not command the confidence of his constituents. (Hear, hear.)⁵⁸ That was Mr. Hincks's opinion; and he hoped hon. gentlemen opposite would profit by that hon. gentleman's experience. From that day to this the double majority principle had been carried out; but hon. gentlemen opposite had just succeeded in making the great and timely discovery that the House had been all along mistaken. Previous administrations had all gone astray — they had been together in the dark. And it was reserved for the present Administration to make the grand discovery, at the most critical moment and in a wonderfully short space of time. (Hear, hear.)⁵⁹ He (Mr. Macdonald) thought the necessary consequence of the resolutions of 1841 was, that the Legislation of the country should be carried on in harmony with the wishes of the people of Canada. But they had deluded themselves, and had gone back to the old days of the Metcalfe tyranny. The hon. gentleman then alluded to the explanations which took place in the Legislative Council Chamber on the position of the Administration. The Attorney General West had said that he protested against the double majority system, and yet said that his colleagues from Lower Canada were never consulted about it. The course that was pursued by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Terrill) in taking office was very extraordinary.

The hon. gentleman then read what Col. Tache had stated in explaining why he called Mr. Terrill to office, and the opinions of the Hon. Mr. Belleau and Mr. Armstrong on the double majority system.⁶⁰ He [Col. Taché] tells Mr. Tyrrell [sic], who has scruples about the system, that he ... did not intend to recognize it; while immediately, when in the Council, hon. Mr. Belleau states that the double majority principle was an absolute necessity under our system of Government, and when hon. Mr. Armstrong asks if his colleagues from Lower Canada had abandoned the double majority principle, the hon. and gallant Colonel replies that their opinion had not been asked. How then was he (Mr. Macdonald) to act in regard to this point. The Premier in one part of his speech states that they don't intend to recognize the principle, and almost immediately after he says the opinion of his colleagues had not been asked upon the subject.⁶¹ In whose name did he speak when he said that they were never consulted. Was it in the name of Attorney General Macdonald, Mr. Vankoughnet, and Mr. Spence? It was a mystery. The Attorney General West had admitted that he protested against double majorities. — Mr. Spence had recognised the double majority principle. Mr. Morrison gave reasons much to the same effect. Mr. Cayley repudiated the principle of governing by a double majority, which means that he would agree that Lower Canada should govern Upper Canada until the day of judgment, so long as he was kept in power; but did he not know that he would be sent for again? Col. Tache's position was that they would govern Upper Canada by a Lower Canadian majority, and pay off Upper Canada for the time when under Lord Metcalf[e]'s he crushed them under foot. Again is there not strong ground for believing that we are coming back to the time when Governors presume to dictate what the people of Upper Canada should do?⁶² He, and those who sent him here, were as tenacious of their loyalty and their attachment to the mother country, as could be found in any part of the country. Glengarry would be the last to strike that glorious flag, while she would be the first to stand for any Governor who maintained constitutional rights. When that which now pretends to govern this country aided and abetted those who stoned the Governor — when the member for Brome, the gentleman who went as a delegate on behalf of the Liberal Conservative party, aided and abetted those who made a most ferocious attack upon the Governor — although the people of Glengarry feel that the bill had been passed to reward men for outrages committed against Her Majesty's prerogative — yet they forgot that, in the consideration that as Canadians and as men, they should stand by Her Majesty's representative. Glengarry was the second county in Upper Canada that dared to call a meeting upon this subject, and if ever he did anything in his life upon which he could look back with satisfaction, it was in being instrumental in getting his friends to stand up and declare that they were ready to defend any Governor who stood by the rights and privileges of the people. They stood by Lord Elgin⁶³ in 1849⁶⁴; but they did not stand by him in 1854, when he violated the constitution, when he called Parliament together and immediately dissolved the House without any bill having been passed. While prepared to defend any Governor who carries out constitutional rights, he was not prepared to submit to a Governor taking upon him to dictate to this House and the country as Sir Edmund Head had recently done, (he said so of course with all due deference to Her Majesty's representative,) but he spoke in behalf of those who sent him here. When he saw the Governor General volunteering his advice to his ministers, and that advice paraded upon the floor of this House, in the manner in which it had been by the Attorney General, he for one was not prepared to submit to it. He wanted to know, for there evidently was some explanation needed, why the Governor General should presume to tell his advisers without being asked why he laid down the doctrine that the double majority principle was illegal and irrational, and that he would not submit to a dissolution upon that account. Why had the Governor threatened the House with his views upon that subject? Did the Cabinet ask him that question? — if so they had not been told of it — or did the Governor volunteer that advice — if so, he has threatened this House and the country, that a dissolution cannot be granted, and that he is opposed to a double majority.⁶⁵

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said he had grave doubts whether the discussion indulged in is strictly in accordance with constitutional usage. The Crown is supposed to have no opinion of its own. It must be taken for granted that His Excellency acted upon the advice of his constitutional advisers, and

his constitutional advisers are bound to take the responsibility of the declaration. In bringing that document before the House the members were supposed to have advised His Excellency as to the course he should take.⁶⁶

MR. J.S. MACDONALD referred to several cases in England in which the Sovereign had in cases of this kind been freely referred to in debate.⁶⁷ The Speaker could not lay it down as a justification of the course these gentlemen pursued if they bring down a document purporting to be the opinion of the Governor, while it was in fact written at their own advising.⁶⁸ He had never known an instance in which a ministry came down with a declaration from the Governor General, except once in Sir Francis Head's time.⁶⁹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the declaration must be supposed to have been made by the advice and with the advice of the constitutional advisers of the Crown.⁷⁰

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that no explanation had been made to the House as to when and where it was proposed to His Excellency that the double majority system should be abandoned. If so, it was contrary to the opinion stated by the Postmaster General, by the Attorney General, and by the member for Niagara.⁷¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said he only wished to prevent the hon. member discussing the opinion of the representative of the Crown. When a declaration is made from the Crown [it] is understood that such declaration is made with the advice of the responsible advisers of the Crown. It would be a very dangerous precedent if any *opinion* from the Crown was discussed, as the individual *opinion* of the Crown.⁷²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD wished to know when His Excellency had been advised, if he had been advised on this subject [sic]. His Excellency does not say he is advised by his counsel, but he comes forward in his individual capacity. However awkward it might be to bring in His Excellency's name into the debates of this House, they were not up to this time placed in a position to say that His Excellency had been called on to give this advice. He took it for granted that the Governor dictated to the hon. gentlemen, and that that dictation is now being carried out. He would never submit to any proceeding taking place by any Governor that would tend to lead them back to the system when governors ruled contrary to the well understood wishes of the country.⁷³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER then left the chair as it was six o'clock.⁷⁴

After the recess⁷⁵,

MR. J.S. MACDONALD continued his remarks. He complained that there had been a concealment of the facts in regard to the extraordinary document, in which his Excellency stated certain views in regard to a dissolution and the double majority principle. There should have been some explanation, by the gallant knight, as to the manner in which his Excellency had been advised to make those statements.⁷⁶ He [Mr. Macdonald] was unwilling to think that His Excellency had volunteered his advice in regard to the double majority principle and the propriety of a dissolution, and he called upon the ministry to say, if they had the manliness to do so — whether they had advised His Excellency on these points or not. If the ministry did not give that advice, then an opinion was given contrary to the constitutional usage of the country. He could not understand why the Governor General should put forward his opinion in flat contradiction to the well understood wishes of the country⁷⁷, which it was unconstitutional for him

to do. His Excellency, however, accepted the resignations of the administration, and entrusted Col. Tache with the task of forming another; and Col. Tache, instead of going to the opposition side of the house, called in again his former colleagues, who had lost the confidence of Upper Canada. So they resumed office; all they cared for being enough Lower Canadian votes to give them a majority of 3 [sic], including their own votes, notwithstanding that they had an Upper Canadian majority of 15 against them. The Lower Canadians might fancy that this arrangement would suit them, as they found the Tory minority of Upper Canada very accommodating to carry out their views. But they should remember how the same principle was applied against themselves in 1845 and 1846, and that by the Attorney General and his friends. They should consider too who were the friends they were allying themselves with. If they deserved the high encomiums of the member for Haldimand, not usually very lavish in his praises, who said there never was a nobler spectacle than that of the Lower Canadians fighting against British misrule, they ought to have discrimination enough to recollect who were their enemies, and who were their friends? Who were their friends? The Reformers. Who their enemies? The Tories, who in 1845 lauded Lord Metcalfe, the tyrant of the Lower Canadians, and in 1849 almost stoned to death a Governor General who was standing by the rights and liberties of the people, and then at the end of his career they tendered an apology, Sir Allan McNab bringing down a fawning, cringing, address, that his administration of the affairs of the country, from first to last, did him honour. They gave Lord Elgin a certificate of character, which seemed to have destroyed his prospects in his own country. No one at home would take him up, because he had been certified to by the gallant knight and his party, who formerly denounced him and charged him with violating the constitution. Were these men in whom confidence could be placed, or whom they could entrust with those important questions, which it required a strong and vigorous administration to grapple with? He supposed his hon. friend from Lambton would not agree with him. It would be refreshing to hear him take the other ground. It would be very gratifying to the member for Nicolet to find the member for Lambton agreeing with him for once. But he warned the Lower Canadians, that the member for Lambton only submitted to the single majority principle now for a time, that he might turn it afterwards against Lower Canada, to carry measures which the Lower Canadians would not like. He left his motion in the hands of the house, not having asked a single member so much as to second it.⁷⁸

MR. LABERGE seconded the motion.⁷⁹

SIR A. MACNAB wished the member for Glengary to believe that there was no attempt to conceal anything on his part.⁸⁰ It was quite true that he and the hon. gentleman who had sat down had been members of this House for many years, and he believed that throughout his public life he did not think that hon. gentleman could point in any one instance to what he was pleased to call duplicity or concealment. Had the hon. member permitted him to answer the question before it would have saved him repeating it. As an Executive Councillor, he was sworn to secrecy; but he could tell the hon. gentleman and this House, that after the meeting which took place in his house — when his colleagues asked him to put their resignations in the hands of His Excellency — he never was at any other meeting afterwards. When he came down to this House to make the explanations which he felt it his duty to make, he never alluded in any manner to the papers to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. If he had felt it necessary, in justification of himself or his colleagues, to bring down these papers to the House and read them, he would have asked [His Excellency's] permission to do so; but he did not think it necessary.⁸¹ His late colleagues appear to have thought differently, and had no doubt asked his Excellency's permission to read that paper.⁸²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Hear.⁸³

SIR A. MACNAB continued. — And had no doubt obtained it.⁸⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — Hear, hear.⁸⁵

SIR A. MACNAB continued. — His colleagues were doubtless desirous of giving the fullest information to the country, and had deemed this paper necessary. He thought it was a somewhat questionable task for the hon. member to assail his Excellency with regard to this paper; but for himself he would merely say that he had no further explanations to give, and if the hon. gentleman imagined that he had wilfully concealed anything, he was entirely mistaken.⁸⁶

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that the gallant knight had entirely misapprehended him. His object was to ascertain whether the Governor General had suggested the idea of a dissolution himself, or whether he was advised on the subject by the Council — if not by the Council, by whom? He could assure the gallant knight that there was a general impression out of doors that the Council was read a severe lecture on two points, and some explanations should be given.⁸⁷ Would the hon. and gallant knight say who it was that asked His Excellency the opinion as to a double majority, and as to the necessity of the dissolution. Was it the Council?⁸⁸

SIR A. MACNAB said he had no further explanation to make upon the subject.⁸⁹

MR. MARCHILDON found nothing more surprising that [sic] that a house which had declared itself in favour of a permanent seat of Government, should when an attempt was made to give effect to that vote, occupy itself with discussions on votes of confidence and want of confidence for fifteen days. He was satisfied that this course would not be approved of by the people of Upper Canada, and that every Upper Canadian county would condemn the conduct of the Upper Canada Opposition, and would impute it to its real cause — a desire to advance personal interests.⁹⁰

MR. MERRITT hoped the hon. member for Glengarry would withdraw his motion, as it was, decidedly, premature, and could do no good but rather evil at present. With reference to the double majority principle, it was one under which no government could be carried on. It seemed to him that it became every day more impossible to carry on the existing union between the Provinces.⁹¹ In order to establish a Government in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people, he would be glad to see the separation of the Union accomplished, and the abolition of a system of Government which after a trial of 15 years, has been found impracticable.⁹² He hoped the hon. member for Glengarry, would not, however, press his motion then, as the sense of the House seemed to be against it.⁹³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said the member for Lincoln had put it out of his power to withdraw the motion by stating that he was opposed to its principle. After such a declaration there was nothing left for him but to go on.⁹⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the hon. member for Glengarry had just favored the house with a long and interesting statement of the early struggles of reformers for the principle of responsible government, which might be exceedingly interesting and valuable as a historical essay; but scarcely affected the principle of the motion before the House. The hon. member had been mixing up together the two questions on which he treated. Now he would beg to state to that hon. member that those questions were not properly bound up together. The question of the responsible government did not include that of the double majority⁹⁵, as it is not incidental to the British constitution, or to our constitution as a transcript of it⁹⁶. It was an evident confusion to mix up both questions. The question of the double majority arose out of the peculiar circumstances of their position — composed as the Province was, of two Provinces [sic] united in one. And responsible government was a direct consequence of their inheritance of the rights of the British Constitution. As he understood responsible government the principle was now fully carried out. The early struggles of the country were to obtain representation in a constitutional assembly — to insist on the advisers of the Crown having the confidence of a majority of the representatives. That principle had been finally acknowledged after many and severe struggles. But that principle

was not involved in the resignation of the late Administration, or the continuance [sic] in office of the present one. In neither cases [sic] had the principle been infringed on. In neither case had there been a direct vote of want of confidence pronounced by the whole house.⁹⁷ He knew it would be argued that, with such a small majority as the present Administration had at the last vote, that that was not a sufficient working majority to enable them to carry on the Government of the country with sufficient vigour and energy, but that remained to be proved. — (Hear, hear.)⁹⁸ The other question of the double majority was, as he had said, a consequence of their position. Of course owing to the preponderance of representation in England over Ireland and Scotland, this question was not likely to arise [there]. The only question likely to arise was whether the Administration of the day had a sufficient majority to enable them to carry on the business of the country. In this country, he was free to admit, the case was different. Disguise it as they might, they were at the time of the Union, two countries possessed of different feelings, principles, laws, and diversity of interests; and therefore it was quite clear that the principle laid down and acted on in this country, that no administration could expect to rule by a majority of one section and a minority of the other section of the Province — the minority would of course, always feel aggrieved. He did not believe that the Government could be successfully carried on against the expressed wishes of the majority of any one section of the Province.⁹⁹ The principle of double majority was foreign to the British constitution, and as a mere theory it could not be supported. The objection that he took to the motion of the hon. member for Glengary was, that it is in effect opening an abstract question, without any thing to support it. The Government had previously stated, after the explanations which took place,¹⁰⁰ [and] he would only say in his opinion they had been sufficiently ample already,¹⁰¹ that they desired to finish the business of the country, (hear, hear); and they called upon the house to aid them in doing so; and this motion of the hon. member, to stop the supplies, would frustrate those intentions, and he wished to assure the hon. gentleman that the responsibility of this course devolved upon him; and he would call upon all hon. members, whatever might be their views upon the question of double majority, to consider well that in admitting its propriety they were not establishing by their vote an abstract proposition, but voting that the Inspector General's motion to go into a committee of the whole, and to carry the necessary supplies would be the effect. It mattered not whether the amendment was disapproved of or not by a majority, it must not be considered as a substantive motion,¹⁰² calling on the House to determine any great constitutional question,¹⁰³ but only as an amendment to defeat the Inspector General's motion. In order that there might be no mistake as to the opinions which his hon. friends around him entertained upon this subject, he would read a motion which he proposed to move at an early day, and he did so in order to give the hon. member for Glengary due notice. He would move it on Friday, if he had the opportunity — (laughter) — of doing so¹⁰⁴ — “That, while the principle of a double Parliamentary majority is not recognised by the constitution, this house is of opinion that any systematic and continuous legislation affecting one section of the Province, contrary to the expressed will of the majority of the Representatives of that section, would be fraught with evil consequences to the well being of the Province, and productive of much injustice.” (Hear, hear. Sensation.) He hoped that hon. members would agree to it¹⁰⁵. He had no doubt that motion would meet the views and support of his hon. friend, the member for Lambton.¹⁰⁶ It was now the desire of the Administration to proceed with the business of the country. (Hear, hear.) They would not be induced to deviate from the course they had taken. They had commanded a majority of the house. Whether that majority was sufficient to carry on the business of the country, it was for the house to announce. They would not open the discussion anew of whether the late Administration were right or wrong in the course they took. The Administration wished to go on with the business of the country and to press forward the great measures which they had indicated to the house, the great consequences of which [were] well known to the house. Some of those questions by being delayed suffered materially, and he and his colleagues threw upon those hon. members who were opposed by their votes or resolutions similar to those of the hon. member for Glengary, the responsibility of injuring the interests of the country. They had every assurance that his Excellency would be prepared to receive their advice to appeal to the country, provided, of course that the essential business of the country was concluded, (hear, hear.)

and if it fell to the lot of the hon. gentlemen opposite to form an Administration if the business of the country was proceeded with, they would find that many questions which would tend to embarrass otherwise, had been settled by this Administration. (Hear, hear.)¹⁰⁷ The responsibility rested upon those hon. gentlemen in trying to keep the Government from bringing on their measures.¹⁰⁸ The majority of the House knew that the country expected that this house would not break up without these great measures being settled. He would, however, vote against this amendment, as being a direct vote for stopping the Administration going on with the Supplies, and as intended to prevent the business of the country going on, and he was prepared to move the resolution of which he had given notice. The hon. member for Glengary had stated that he was prepared to let all these great measures go to the wall. Mr. J.S. Macdonald had said, it was far better that all the old measures of the Government should meet that fate, if they did not declare their intended policy.¹⁰⁹

MR. BROWN said, Mr. Speaker, we are placed in a most extraordinary position. The hon. member for Glengary brings forward a motion in favour of the double majority system; the leader of the Government denounces the principle and the motion — but to save his followers from deserting, actually gives notice that he intends to bring forward a resolution recognising to all intents and purposes that very same double majority system he condemns my hon. friend for proposing. (Hear, hear.) True, sir, the Attorney General's resolution is to condemn the systematic ruling of one section by the votes of the other — but who is to decide when the "systematic" point shall be reached?¹¹⁰

A Member. — The common sense of the house.¹¹¹

MR. BROWN. — Ah! The common sense of the house. Well, then, the hon. Attorney General had better apply his new rule at once — for the house will tell him now, that according to their common sense, he is carrying out the double majority system in the most systematic and objectionable manner. (Hear, hear.) What is the hon. gentleman attempting to do at this moment? Is he striving to carry through two or three measures with a Lower Canada majority? No. He has had two formal votes of this house, in which the majority of the representatives of Upper Canada have declared that they have no confidence in the present Administration, that their whole policy is condemned — and one of these votes declaring directly that they could no longer entrust the public money to the care of those hon. gentlemen; and yet they keep their seats in defiance of these declarations — they propose to carry, if they can, several of the most important measures which have ever been brought before the country, (hear, hear,) — and yet they prate to us about the evils of the single majority "systematically" adopted. (Cheers.) I do think that if it were possible to place their position in a worse light than it was before, the Administration have effected it completely by this resolution, of which they now give notice to pacify their followers. In regard to the motion of my hon. friend from Glengary, I fancy there can be no doubt as to the course which every Upper Canadian Reformer ought to take — and that is, without the slightest hesitation, to vote against it. (Hear, hear.) The object of my hon. friend, in bringing this motion before the house, is perfectly clear. It is intended as a bait for the French Canadian supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite. (Hear, hear.)¹¹²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — I have always been of these opinions.¹¹³

MR. BROWN. — Very true; my hon. friend has always held these opinions, but he never uttered them before, and so good an opportunity for uttering them with effect, never occurred before. He must be a very dull observer who has not perceived that of late there has been an exceeding restlessness among French gentlemen opposite — that they are far from feeling comfortable¹¹⁴. Can it be doubted for one moment that some hon. members are looking about for a new political state, (laughter),¹¹⁵ — and if not looking about for a new state of political existence, (renewed laughter, and hear, hear,) they are at least almost ready for a new political alliance. (Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the member

for Glengary is a shrewd politician; he well knows the terror of some members of this house of Representation by Population and other coming Reforms; he knows the fear of Upper Canada one day ruling Lower Canada, as Lower Canada now rules Upper Canada, and feeling that, from his long experience and standing in Parliament, he is in a position to rescue these timorous French members from their awkward position, he strikes while the iron is hot with his double majority motion. (Sensation and loud cheers.) Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend very evidently is preparing for the formation of a new political alliance. (Hear, hear.) I speak this frankly because I entertain the greatest regard for my hon. friend, and do not wish to see him put himself into any such false position as that he is running into. I have risen for the purpose of pointing out to him in the most friendly manner that he is quite wrong in his present course, that if he succeeded in frightening the hon. gentlemen opposite into an alliance with him, and got thereby on the Treasury Benches, his seat on those benches would be of short duration, and miserable at that. (Laughter and cheering.) My hon. friend, if he succeeded in his evident object, would simply place himself in the false and degraded place occupied by the Reformers of Upper Canada in the Hinck's-Morin combination, and by the Postmaster General and those who think with him in this, and his end, like theirs, would just be this, that at the end of a few months, or possibly of years, he would be turned adrift with a broken down political reputation. (Hear, hear.) I lost the advantage of hearing the whole of the argument of my hon. friend in support of his motion, but I presume that the general tenor of it is embraced in his resolution. The hon. gentleman starts by quoting one of the resolutions of the 3rd September, 1841, moved by Mr. Harrison, and adopted by the Reform party of United Canada as one of the Constitutional principles of our Government¹¹⁶, and which has been recognised ever since in the Government of the country¹¹⁷, and he proceeds to engraft on it his double majority addition. — Now, I think that my hon. friend ought not to have dragged in the authors of these resolutions, even as apparently in favour of the principle he advocates; for if there ever was a doctrine utterly condemned and repudiated by the Reformers of '41, it is this of the double majority. (Hear, hear.) Has my hon. friend forgotten that in the time of the late Administration there was a distinct proposition made for the Union of the Conservative majority of Upper Canada with the French Canadian majority of Lower Canada, and that Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Lafontaine, Mr. Hincks, Mr. Harrison, and every prominent member of the party, including my hon. friend, who had any pretensions to constitutional authority went thoroughly and earnestly against it? Does the hon. member for Glengary forget the consistent and manly manner in which the gentlemen from Lower Canada then stuck to their political friends of Upper Canada, and refused to be led away by the seduction of the double majority principle, so attractively displayed to them through the intervention of Mr. Caron? My hon. friend asks me "what did Mr. Baldwin do in 1841¹¹⁸ [OR] 1851?"¹¹⁹ I say that what Mr. Baldwin did ... was quite correct, and that he never adopted the double majority system, or entertained it for a moment.¹²⁰

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — Perhaps you did not read the whole debate?¹²¹

MR. BROWN. — I recollect well the whole discussion which took place, and I am quite sure that my hon. friend is not justified in his remarks as to Mr. Baldwin's position. The vote on which Mr. Baldwin retired was a condemnation of the Court of Chancery as remodelled by Mr. Baldwin; and he held that it was a direct vote of want of confidence in him individually as the chief Law officer of the Crown.¹²² He did not say that it was a vote of want of confidence in the whole administration, but against him as the constructor of a new judiciary system, and Mr. Baldwin considered that the vote given was such an expression of want of confidence in his ability for carrying on his own department, that he thought proper to resign.¹²³ And did Mr. Baldwin, though retiring himself, conceive it the duty of the Ministry to resign? Not at all. He told the very opposite to the house; and I well recollect that Mr. Hincks on the same occasion stated that he had offered to resign with Mr. Baldwin; that Mr. Baldwin urged him not to do so, for it was a mere departmental vote, and his colleagues ought to retain office. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Baldwin held office until his successor was appointed; and I am sure nothing could be more unjust

than to quote him as an apologist for what I have always held to be the demoralizing principle of double majority legislation. (Hear, hear.)¹²⁴

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — What did Mr. Hincks say?¹²⁵

MR. BROWN. — What did Mr. Hincks say? asks my hon. friend. I am free to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it matters very little what Mr. Hincks said on such a subject.¹²⁶ How the hon. member for Glengarry, after quoting the fathers of Responsible Government, in 1841, after quoting them in favor of his principle, while, in fact, they were against it, can persist in his views, I am at a loss to conceive. He says "that in order to ensure the due exercise of this right, &c., &c." We all admit Mr. Hincks' singular ability in finding an expedient for momentary difficulties¹²⁷; but to say that his opinion as a constitutional authority is entitled to great weight is not, I apprehend, a tenable position; if ever greater constitutional imprudences were committed by a politician in this country than those of Mr. Hincks, I would be glad to have the man pointed out!¹²⁸ But it is all very well for the hon. member for Glengarry to take the views he has of these gentlemen whom he has quoted.¹²⁹ My hon. friend has a far stronger argument in favour of his motion, than the opinions of our predecessors. He has a state of things before him which enables him to present his subject in the strongest light, when he exclaims — "There sit those hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury Benches with a majority of fifteen Upper Canadian votes against them, and yet they carry on the business of the country and force upon us, by Lower Canada votes, measures and principles which are not acceptable to Upper Canada." My hon. friend has here his strongest possible [sic] argument, but even here his position is not tenable, for the transactions of the last few days show clearly the single majority principle carries with it its own remedy, and that it is utterly impossible to rule Lower Canada long by an Upper Canadian majority; or *vice versa*. (Hear, hear.) A fortnight ago the Government were beaten by an Upper Canadian majority — and what was the immediate effect? why the very fact of that defeat operated so effectually and immediately that only a few days afterwards they were defeated by an Upper Canadian majority of fifteen, (hear, hear,) and only saved themselves by their own votes from a defeat in the whole house. And who for a moment doubts that if the house were full now, and the vote were again to be taken, the Ministry could avoid being beaten by a larger majority of the whole house. Every body now knows that they have lost the confidence of the house and of the country. And nothing tended so much to take away the last lingering vestige of adherence from them as that vote given against them by an Upper Canada majority. And if it were possible for them to fall lower than they now are, the fact that they condescend to keep their seats in defiance of that vote, is the very thing to do it. (Hear, hear.) There sits the Postmaster General, who was wont to prate so loudly that he represented the Reformers of Upper Canada in the Government, without one Upper Canada Reformer at his back — what, I would like to know, could possibly restore to that gentleman the forfeited confidence of the people of Upper Canada? I am sure the hon. gentleman will regret long years hence, that he degraded himself and his office, by clinging to his place and his salary, after so marked an expression of the feelings of Upper Canada. He and his colleagues must feel, if they can feel anything, that every day they remain in their present places, they lower themselves in the public estimation, and remove further from their every hope of ever recovering their positions in Upper Canada. My hon. friend from Glengarry need be under no apprehension that a precise rule is necessary to save either section from being ruled by a majority of the other. Any Government attempting to proceed upon such a principle would soon find an opinion so strong brought against them, that they could not stand. I think my hon. friend, and other members of this house make an entire mistake, when they fancy that the Government of this country is carried on as can be carried on, by the mere number of votes ... over and over again that, let a Government have as many votes as it may, let its majority be as large as you like, the moment it loses the confidence of the country, that moment the stability of the administration is gone. True, the Draper Administration commenced with but a majority of three and ruled for three years, but it was unable to effect any legislation of importance, and when a general election came, it had its reward and was swept out of existence. Scarcely

one of its members or supporters showed their faces in the new Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Then came the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, which had a large majority from both sections. But how long did they last? Only two sessions. They had to the last a great majority, but public opinion was brought to bear on them so strongly that, notwithstanding their majority, they had to yield before the end of the second session. So it was with the Hincks-Morin Government. When they assembled in 1852, they had an immense majority in both houses — but in one session we broke them down. Their policy and measures were tried and found wanting, and they themselves lost the confidence of the country. And the hon. gentlemen opposite, have they not been broken down in precisely the same way? What has lost them the confidence of the country, but their administrative incapacity and the character of their measures? Have we not seen their supporters leaving them one after another, and some of them even declaring they were forced to go into opposition by the coercion of public opinion, against their personal feelings? It is not then mere votes or mere numbers that can sustain a Government. It is the principles upheld by an administration, the policy it affirms, that determines its success. If an administration has popular measures, and boldly avows them, and if its members are prepared to carry them out in a vigorous and manly manner, no fear but they will be able to carry on, whether their supporters come from Upper or Lower Canada. There are but two ways in which you can conduct the affairs of this country. You must either maintain the Union or dissolve it.¹³⁰

MR. DUFRESNE. — Dissolve it!¹³¹

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman says, Dissolve it. That is precisely the point of the argument, and it is the point I have been endeavouring to put, ever since I had a seat in this house. We have two countries, two languages, two religions, two habits of thought and action, and the question is can you possibly carry on the government of both with one Legislature and one executive? That is the question to be solved. And I appeal to the House to consider, whether the first duty we owe to ourselves and to the country, is not to sit down and endeavour to discover whether those differences which exist between us are insurmountable or not — whether we cannot find some basis of agreement, some just principles of legislation on which we can carry on the Government, without those scenes of sectional jealousy and discord that are now so frequently witnessed in this house. (Hear, hear.) For my own part, I must admit that although many of my friends in the house and in the country, have given up the idea of our being able to continue the Union, and look to a Dissolution as the only resource, I have not got that length; but still contemplate the idea of a Dissolution with the greatest pain. I am considered to represent the most extreme party in Upper Canada, the party holding the strongest views as in opposition to those of Lower Canada. From my experience even of the most extreme party of the Lower Canadians, I do not despair of our yet agreeing to the recognition of principles fair and equal to both sections. The hon. member for Kamouraska is about the most extreme man in the whole house; but I am quite sure that if even he and I were to dismiss prejudice, and sit down deliberately to seek a common basis on which the affairs of the country could be harmoniously carried on, we should have no great difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory issue. My hon. friend from Glengary did not do me justice when he warned hon. gentlemen opposite from Lower Canada — “If you vote down my motion, consider what will befall you. You will have the member for Lambton, with us Upper Canadians coming down upon you one of these days, and ruling you with a rod of iron, by the application of this very principle which you have recognized in voting down my motion.” I do not think my hon. friend should have made any such statement. He has sat beside me for several years, and he knows well that there is nothing I repudiate more strongly than such a course as he depicts. (Hear, hear.) If I have urged on this house, week after week and month after month, those principles which I hold in common with the great mass of the people of Upper Canada, it is not that I seek any unjust advantage for my own section, but that we may find some common basis on which the affairs of the country may be carried on, with equal justice to both; and I defy him to show a principle I have ever held or enunciated in opposition to this. I have contended, for example, for Representation

by Population. Will any one deny that that is fair and equal? Did not the Lower Canadians themselves contend for it for years after the Union?¹³²

MR. LORANGER. — It is impossible!¹³³

MR. BROWN. — The hon. member for Laprairie says it is impossible. Well, if it comes to that it is just as impossible for the people of Upper Canada to submit to be deprived of representation by population, as it is impossible for the people of Lower Canada to grant it.¹³⁴

Loud cheers from Upper Canada members.¹³⁵

MR. LORANGER. — That is not the question.¹³⁶

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman will find that *it is* the question. You cannot hope to carry on the affairs of the country with injustice to Upper Canada any more than with injustice to Lower Canada, and so long as the people of Upper Canada have 300,000 greater population, and pay three-fourths of the whole Provincial revenue, they will not submit to having merely the same number of votes in the Legislature as Lower Canada. (Cheers.) If we do not get this, as the member for Montcalm has said, the only alternative is a Dissolution of the Union. There is not a single Upper Canada member of this house who can possibly be returned again, unless he pledges himself to the principle of Representation by Population; and, supposing that hon. gentlemen opposite retired, and another Cabinet should be formed by the member for Laprairie and his friends, and they got my hon. friend for Glengary to join them in refusing Representation by Population, — where would it end? Do they think we would not continue our agitation — that we would cease to move the same motions, as heretofore, in favour of that principle? Would not those hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury Benches, when they came over to our side, revive their own motions of 1851, 1852, 1853 and 1854? (Cheers.) Do you think the Postmaster General would not hoist once more his old platform of 1851, the very moment he came to this side? and where would my hon. friend from Glengary then be, if he attempted to carry on his Government in defiance of that principle? In 18 months, he and any of his friends who joined him would be broken-down bankrupt politicians. Let my hon. friend take care what he is about. He has for years maintained a high position in an honourable and dignified manner before the country, and I hope he has not taken up this double majority principle for the sake of political effect, with a view to the formation of new combinations, which could only end in disappointment and disgrace. Office ought to be the mere means to the great end of accomplishing public ends, and not the end sought. (Hear, hear.) And if my hon. friend so far forgets himself as to enter the government in opposition to any principle he has supported on this side of the house, he will do himself great injustice and his country grievous wrong. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend, in his view of this double majority question, has merely taken up the question of votes; but there is surely something far beyond this. There is a question of moral principle deeply involved in it. Let us suppose for a moment that he were to carry his motion, and this house should declare that the government must be sustained by a majority from Upper Canada and a majority from Lower Canada. Col. Tache represents and leads the Lower Canadian majority, and we shall say that my hon. friend might get a majority from Upper Canada to support him. What in such circumstances would be the effect of the strict establishment of the double majority principle? Do Col. Tache and my hon. friend agree in their political views? My hon. friend is a Progressive — “with modifications.” Col. Tache is a Conservative — a Lower Canada Conservative — and we all know that Lower Canada Conservatism is far more Tory than Upper Canada Toryism. How then would my hon. friend carry out his principle? Col. Tache would guide the helm in Lower Canada, and my hon. friend here; but each must vote for the measures of the other — each must have two consciences — one for Lower Canada and the other for Upper Canada. Col. Tache would bring forward his Tory measures for Lower Canada, and my hon. friend would support them with his Lower Canada conscience. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend will bring forward his Reform

measures for Upper Canada, and Col. Tache would vote for them with a Western Reform conscience. (Hear, hear.)¹³⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — Who are you talking about? (Laughter.)¹³⁸

MR. BROWN. — I am only carrying out the principles of my hon. friend to their legitimate conclusion. And I am sure that, shrewd and sharp-sighted as he is, he did not make that motion, without anticipating that it would have a damaging effect on the other side, and without being prepared to meet the responsibility which his own action might bring upon him. (Hear, hear.) If the government should be broken down by this motion, could my hon. friend shrink from the position he has taken up? And if Col. Tache, having a majority of Lower Canadians, called upon him to form the Upper Canadian section of the cabinet, could he shrink from carrying out his own principles, if he could find a majority to go with him?¹³⁹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — I knew well that the party on the other side would support the administration at all risks. My hon. friend may relieve himself of any alarm about my going over.¹⁴⁰

MR. BROWN. — I am not alarmed about my hon. friend going over — but I am persuaded the suggestions I have been making to him will commend themselves to his good sense, and forbid the unholy alliance, — (Laughter) — and if he will allow me, I will add my intreaty to the advice tendered by the hon. member for Lincoln, that my hon. friend would withdraw his motion¹⁴¹, if [he] ... did not wish to degrade himself from his present proud position.¹⁴² But, Sir, I was going on to observe upon the demoralizing effect of this principle.¹⁴³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — At all events don't put me into office.¹⁴⁴

MR. BROWN. — I do not desire to see my hon. friend a member of the Government, except in conjunction with my hon. friend from Montreal and other men of Liberal principles on this side of the house. That is the proper position for him to occupy, and which I am sure he will occupy, when another session comes round, and my hon. friend should not lose sight of this. We are soon to have a general election. Hon. gentlemen opposite may strive to conceal it as they like, but it is beyond all sort of doubt that we will have an election ere many weeks elapse. I do not think there is a member of the house who dares deny that the Opposition will come back with a large majority from Upper Canada. If the administration will consult their Reform supporters on the back benches, they will be amply certified of this. Now, suppose the Upper Canadian Opposition returns here with a strength of from 40 to 45 representatives.¹⁴⁵

Cries of oh! from the ministerial side.¹⁴⁶

[MR. BROWN continued:] Hon. gentlemen may cry oh, but they will find I am speaking within the mark; and then I ask with whom, in such a case, would my hon. friend have us join? Ought not our alliance to be continued with the progressive party of Lower Canada, represented by the hon. member for ... and his friends? Will my hon. friend say that he would cast them aside, because they might not have an absolute majority of Lower Canada members from the very start, and join himself to a party with which he can have no sympathies in common? Does he not know how Governments grow in strength, how rapidly their supporters increase, when their measures are popular and for the general good of the country, and when they carry firmness and prudence into the Administration of public affairs? Would my hon. friend leave the Progressive party of Lower Canada in the lurch, because they numbered one or two less than an absolute majority of their section, and form a junction with the Conservatives, no — he has too much manliness and good sense to act thus. Let my hon. friend rest assured of this: when a Government is clearly shown to have lost the confidence of the house, when their supporters are leaving them, when the country is speaking out against them, when their policy and measures are generally

condemned, there is no necessity for applying any strict rule as to when they are to go out, or how long they may stay in. Public opinion will soon force them to go. (Hear, hear.) Do we not see this in the position of hon. gentlemen opposite? They have been broken down by public opinion, and it is impossible for them to keep their seats on the Treasury Benches.¹⁴⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — Lord Metcalfe kept his Government in for three years, in defiance of public opinion.¹⁴⁸

MR. BROWN. — That was an extreme case. It could not have taken place without the concurrence of all three branches of the Legislature; and even with such concurrence, it could not be done now. The country learned an excellent lesson during these three years. By the severe trial through which our constitutional liberties passed during that period, the people were educated into the knowledge of their rights, and the same thing could no more be repeated at the present day, than it is possible for the existing Administration to keep their seats for another session. (Cheers.) We need have very little fear on that score, when we see those hon. gentlemen tottering to their fall, and unable, as the member for Shefford has said, to stand for three weeks longer. Mr. Speaker, the whole matter resolves itself into a question of union or dissolution. (Cheers.) It is a matter of serious consideration for every member of this house — for every statesman in this country — I care not to what party or section he belongs; — hon. gentlemen may try to conceal it, but just so sure as we do not soon find some remedy for our sectional difficulties — some means of removing those obstacles which stand in the way of the harmonious working of the Union between Upper and Lower Canada — just so surely will we be forced by our constituents to dissolve this Union. (Hear, hear.) Some hon. gentlemen persistently represent me as an impracticable and extreme man — as one determined to force on Lower Canada everything Upper Canadian, and to rule the Eastern section for Upper Canadian purposes, without any regard to the feelings and interests of the East. Nothing could be more unjust. When I came into this house, I stood almost alone, and when a man stands alone in a crowd, advocating a great cause, he must take up a bold position and tone if he is to be heard at all. But I have never for one moment taken up the ground that we in Upper Canada are to rule this Province without regard to the views of Lower Canada. All I have ever asked is the adoption of general principles, just and equitable for both.¹⁴⁹ (Hear, hear.)¹⁵⁰

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — If that is not a bid! (Laughter.)¹⁵¹

MR. LORANGER. — It is a bait!¹⁵²

MR. BROWN. — My hon. friend says this is a bid! If so, then I have been bidding for five years. Hon. members from Lower Canada know well that they have never had any bait thrown out to them from this quarter, and I am not likely to begin now. Hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada can say if I have ever altered my position in the slightest, to conciliate [sic] their favour. (No, no.) I am just the member of this house who stands in a position to enable him to say, without any fear of suspicion, that I am prepared to meet the gentlemen of Lower Canada in seeking fair and reasonable grounds for a settlement of those differences which are between us.¹⁵³

No, no, from the ultra-montaneists [sic].¹⁵⁴

[MR. BROWN continued:] Well, you may go on crying that to the end of the chapter, but you will awake some day and find that a Dissolution of the Union, by your folly, is rendered inevitable; and I appeal to you as statesmen, as patriots, whether you do well in forcing that result? Sir, I think no man can cast his thoughts forward a few years, and picture to himself what might be the future position of this country, if wisdom and firmness sat at the helm of public affairs, without feeling deep regret at the thought that a Dissolution of the Union may be forced upon us.¹⁵⁵ (Hear, hear.)¹⁵⁶ It does appear to

me that if we could remove those sectional difficulties — and really they are far from insurmountable — that if we could agree upon principles which would prevent injustice to any section of the community, we might look forward to bright days in the future history of our country. I think we have the elements, in the different races among us, for forming¹⁵⁷ an admirable homogenous people — as fine a race of men as any on the earth.¹⁵⁸ (Cheers.) We have material resources unsurpassed by any country, and the two sections of the Province may be most useful to each other. Lower Canada has great manufacturing facilities; Upper Canada has great agricultural resources; our navigation is in common — our interests are the same. If we could but remove our sectional difficulties, I am persuaded we might anticipate a day of very great and lasting prosperity. Nearly the half of this vast continent is in our hands. Can any Canadian take the map, and observe that the British portion consti[t]utes one half of North America — without feeling the responsibility that rests upon us to see that the immense tract to the north of us shall not be left a wilderness for ever? (Cheers.) Is not their trust committed to us, to say how this boundless territory shall be peopled? And is there one man who takes a statesmanlike view of the subject, who will not admit that it is by union and not dissolution that we will best seek to discharge the important trust committed to us? And how shall we keep united? By looking our dissensions firmly in the face and settling them amicably. How have the United States been kept so long together? Sir, I apprehend that the general conditions on which the United States are linked together, are the only principles in which you can have a federation of men of different races and different religions. (Cheers.) I ask for no more in Canada than is incorporated in the constitution of the United States by the fathers of the American Republic; and whatever we may think of their successors, I am sure there is not a man in this house who does not contemplate with ardent admiration the fathers of the American Republic, and the noble principles they laid down. And can any man fancy that we can raise a great nation in the north to emulate our neighbours — that we can fill up those boundless regions which surround us, on any less enlightened principles than those adopted by Washington and his compeers? That is the full extent of my demand — it is for that I have ever contended.¹⁵⁹ He [Mr. Brown] would most solemnly say that his only object in bringing up this question, as he had done on numberless occasions, was to force it on the attention of the House, in order to arrive at some fair settlement.¹⁶⁰

MR. BELLINGHAM. — Why, then, do you oppose the North Shore Railroad?¹⁶¹

MR. BROWN. — The hon. gentleman had better wait till the North Shore Railroad question comes up. He had better not make sure that I am not one of the strongest supporters of the North Shore Road.¹⁶²

Loud cheers by the Lower Canadian members.¹⁶³

[MR. BROWN continued:] I can only repeat more fully, Mr. Speaker, what I said before on this question, that if the Commissioner of Crown Lands is prepared to substantiate the statements he made the other night; if he is prepared to show that the country through which the road is to pass is of the character he described; that there are the millions of acres of valuable land that he spoke of; that the soil can be brought into a high cultivation; that the timber is of the value he described; that the water privileges are such as he told us — if, I say, he can show all this, and prove it to our satisfaction in the same manner as we judge of other lines of road, — if he will come down with¹⁶⁴ a complete survey to be made of that territory, and the report of that survey confirmed his statements — then, when the whole of the facts and statements were submitted to the House, if it were shown clearly that the project could be successfully carried out — he [Mr. Brown] for one, was willing to support the undertaking. (Ironical cries of hear, hear, and laughter.)¹⁶⁵ But what I objected to in the course of the administration on this matter is this — that for a petty political end, for the miserable object of securing¹⁶⁶ the votes of the member[s] from Quebec,¹⁶⁷ and for nothing else, without any survey, without any accurate knowledge of the country, without any knowledge of what would be the prospects of such a railroad, they come down and ask us,

on the mere statement of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, to hand over four millions of acres of the public domain to a set of private individuals.¹⁶⁸ (Hear, hear.)¹⁶⁹ And with regard to the scheme of the hon. gentleman, I must say that I am not prepared to put four millions of acres into the hands of any corporation, however wise its management, or however good its object. I believe that such a course would be inimical to the best interests of the country. If we are to make Canada progress as steadily and rapidly as it ought, it is by throwing open our lands for actual settlement, in limited quantities, to all comers, and drawing thereby to our shores the tide of immigration. I am persuaded that the system adopted by the hon. member for Norfolk, when in office, and which has been found to work so admirably, is the true one; and it would be far better — a thousand times better — for the interests of this country, that you should give aid to any enterprise direct from the public chest, than that you should hand over the public lands to be trafficked in by speculators. (Hear, hear.) But I have wandered, and must return to my subject. I think my hon. friend has made an entire mistake in bringing forward this motion. As I have said, there are but two ways in which you can carry on the Government of this country. You must either hold that the Province is one, and strive as soon as possible to assimilate our institutions, and to apply some fair and uniform principle of legislation to the whole province, or else you may dissolve at once. To attempt to carry on the government on the double majority principle, would be utterly demoralizing. Why is it that so many administrations have been broken down one after another? Our public men go into the administration big with hope. Honest and honourable men, many of them, when they came into this house — but, seduced by their political connections, they go upon the treasury benches expected to carry out principles they professed at the hustings, but which they ought to know they must have acknowledged before taking office, or they will not be at all. Once in the Executive Council chamber, they find there one principle of government for Lower Canada and another for Upper Canada, they see they must either resign their places or trample upon their principles and their pledges — they keep their seats — they lose the confidence of the country, and, after a brief space, leave the treasury benches bankrupt politicians. (Hear, hear.) Are we to go on for ever with a system so utterly demoralizing. This motion is simply to recognize formally the atrocious system. I hope my hon. friend, far from putting such a motion — far from seeking to have it affirmed, as a constitutional principle, that the statesmen of this country shall have two consciences, one for Upper and another for Lower Canada — will direct his ability and energy towards the maintenance of the Union, in its integrity and the adoption of some just uniform plan of policy and legislation for the whole Province. This is the only true and honest aim — the only course which can save us from that ultimate point, to which I am afraid we are fast tending — a Dissolution of the Union. (Cheers.)¹⁷⁰

MR. LORANGER supported the double majority principle, considering it the safe-guard not merely of Upper Canada or Lower Canada, but of Canada at large. He did not think the member for Lambton was consistent in going against the double majority principle, while at the same time he advocated the principle of Representation by Population. The double majority principle had been advocated by such men as Lafontaine and Baldwin. The member for Lambton hoped the time would come when we should be one great and homogeneous people, and when that time arrived, he confessed the system of double majority would be unnecessary, but that happy time had not yet arrived. He was not prepared to say that the provisions of the Union were such as to meet the wants of the people, but so long as it did exist, it should be taken with all its consequences, and the double majority principle was one of them.¹⁷¹

MR. DUFRESNE was in favour of the double majority principle, but could not vote for the motion of the member for Glengary, as it comprehended a great many other principles.¹⁷²

MR. EVANTUREL coincided in the correctness of the principle of a double majority, but would be compelled to vote against the motion, as it laid down in precise terms a proposition which if adopted would never be henceforth departed from, because he believed that occasions might arise when the double majority principle — however correct in itself — should be departed from.¹⁷³

MR. DRUMMOND said that although there was nothing in the Union Act declaring it necessary that they should be guided in their proceedings by a double majority, yet they found in the Union Act the federal principle laid down, which renders it necessary that Government should [be] carried on, on the principle of having a majority of both sections of the province. By that federal principle each section of the country must be represented by an equal member [sic] of representatives — and, therefore from that fact they must come to the conclusion that no Government should be maintained in the country, which could not obtain a majority of both sections of the Province. This is a necessary consequence of that federal principle laid down in the Union Act¹⁷⁴; but he did not conceive it necessary that a double majority should be obtained in every case. He had said in a few words, that he would look on a man who refrained from carrying a measure of grave importance to the general interests of the country by a vote of one section, as a man unworthy of holding a position in the councils of the country; but he would look on a man that would govern this country systematically by a majority from one section of the country as a tyrant at heart. He had protested against a dissolution of the late Cabinet when it had a majority from one section against it,¹⁷⁵ while there was a majority of the whole House of 23 [in its favour]¹⁷⁶, because he believed that — under all the circumstances of the case, perceiving that the mass of the people of Upper Canada did not disapprove of the course of the Government — though a few representatives were influenced to desert it on a mere local question — ministers were bound to exercise their discretion¹⁷⁷ before dissolving the Government upon that occasion. It was due to them as statesmen to say “We shall not resign until we shall have carried out those measures which have already been carried through several stages by a majority of both sections of the country.” He felt, however, that they were bound to strengthen themselves with the representativ[e]s of Upper Canada, and failing to do so, to resign. But these gentlemen persisted in resigning in the hope of recovering themselves, under the impression that so soon as the *leader* of the government was *gone* the confidence of the people would return to them; but when he saw these gentlemen return, and instead of recovering their lost influence they found themselves in a worse position than before — then he felt convinced that those gentlemen ought not to continue to conduct the affairs of this country, beyond simply the carrying out of those measures which have already been carried through several stages by a majority of the representatives from both sections. In that respect he was willing to support them and sustain them in their endeavors to carry these measures through. He wished to see these measures carried through, and he wished to see them assume the responsibility of it. He regretted very much that these gentlemen should have determined to go into supplies to-night. He urged them strongly to allow the House to carry through some of those practical measures, which, if not carried through at once will entail consequences of a frightful nature. He alluded to the Seigniorial measure, which would not have taken a quarter of an hour, and which, if it had been carried through, would have enabled the commissioners to go on with their proceedings. He was anxious to see them removed and he implored the government to allow that measure to be carried through; but they would not — they would go on with the question of supplies. He knew that if they did so, another discussion would go on to test the confidence of the House. He was not in the House when the Attorney General (Mr. Macdonald) made some explanations in reference to the motion before the House. He understood that the hon. gentleman pledged himself that he would come down to the House on Friday, with a motion affirming a principle upon which he was prepared to take his stand — a principle which, in his estimation, was even of more importance than the question of representation by population. He struggled against that principle during three or four years; but he had now changed his mind in reference to it, although he entirely spurned the idea that any government should resign upon any particular measure merely because it had not a majority from both sections of the country.¹⁷⁸ On some questions he would conceive that a ministry could well avail itself of a majority from one section of the Province, even where the vote was an adverse one from the section principally affected. He would refer to the Seigniorial Tenure Bill, as an instance where he would be disposed to avail himself of an Upper Canada majority¹⁷⁹. The Seigniorial Tenure Bill ... was a measure of a particular character. The people of Lower Canada were divided into two hostile sections, and he would not have hesitated to carry such a measure by a majority from

Upper Canada, because they were the best arbitrators to decide between our own people. There are other questions which he would not hesitate to carry with a majority from one section, but to persist systematically to rule by a majority from one section would amount to nothing short of tyranny. He could not go for the Attorney General's motion because he considered the germ of the double majority principle was found in the Union Act. But he would wish to know before proceeding further, whether it was the intention of the government to persist in going on with the supplies, without proceeding to take up other measures. He entertained, he would say, a dread which he would not hesitate to express. He entertained a strong apprehension that these hon. gentlemen if they could carry the supplies would bid us "good bye," and we would hear no more of them until another session. (Hear, hear.) He had opposed a dissolution, and he was opposed to it now; because there was no reason to dissolve the House, especially so far as Lower Canada was concerned. He thought there were abundant means to form a strong government in this House as it is, and therefore he would repudiate the idea of dissolving the House at present. If these gentlemen are sincere in their desire to carry out some of these great measures that have been before the House, they would not speak of a dissolution. He could not see how he could do otherwise than vote for the resolutions of the hon. member for Glengarry, although one of them was so worded as to convey a meaning different from that intended by the hon. mover. He had no doubt the Ministry would have a majority. He would therefore again express a wish to know whether they would continue to press on their supplies before they had done any other business.¹⁸⁰

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER replied that the intention of the Government was to go into Committee of Supply and make some progress, and then take up the other measures — among others the very Bill to which the member for Shefford had alluded, and to the importance of which the Government was by no means indifferent.¹⁸¹

MR. DORION. — That is not an answer to the hon. gentleman's question.¹⁸²

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — I have got nothing further to say.¹⁸³

MR. TURCOTTE asked the member for Glengary to withdraw his motion.¹⁸⁴

MR. J.S. MACDONALD replied that he could not.¹⁸⁵

MR. TURCOTTE said that in that case he must vote against it; and for this reason, that the principle of a double majority pushed to its limit would be an absurdity. The principle of a double majority is correct in the abstract, and he would go so far as to say that any section of an administration having a vote of non-confidence pure and simple carried against it, by a majority from its own section of the Province, should resign. But while admitting this, there is a constitutional reason for his not voting for this motion, and that was that it is useless and extremely dangerous to attempt to write a constitution for us. In England, they understand these things well, and there they are guided by practice and precedent in interpreting the constitution. In fact, any member of the House of Commons attempting to write a rule for the purpose of explaining the constitution would be laughed at. For these reasons he would oppose the motion before the house.¹⁸⁶

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member from Shefford had said in very plain language that the Union Act lays down a certain federal principle by giving an equal numbers [sic] of members from each section of the country. But the difficulty was, they had no means of checking the aggressive majority, whether from Lower Canada or from Upper Canada. Could anything be more plain than in 1850 it was the desire of Upper Canada that that civil tribunal known as the Court of Chancery should be abolished — that in spite of that loudly expressed desire the majority from Lower Canada voted that it should remain, and there it remains to this day. In the next Parliament we had the same motion, and again a

majority from Lower Canada had no hesitation in the world in forcing upon us against our wishes a court which it was clearly shown we did not want. So too in the Draper Administration. The Lower Canada members were used in a way very improper and unjust. So too in regard to the Executive Council itself. In 1851 the Executive Council of New Brunswick, where Sir Edmund Head came from, was composed of nine gentlemen, three only of whom received pay, but at the same time no business was done unless there was a majority of the whole Council present. That is an economical [sic] system; but ours is one of profligacy — for all the ten members have salaries and the business can be done by a mere quorum of the council — while the Governor being the nominee of the Crown has instructions from England as to how he shall be guided. There was no doubt that the bringing in of Mr. Vankoughnet into the council and swearing him in while as yet he was the representative of no constituency was a high-handed measure. It was telling the 120 [sic] members of the House that none of them were fit for such a position. Although it was not proper at the end of two years to dissolve the House, yet he would prefer that course, to see what kind of a House would turn up. There was a large class of electors now who had no voice in the elections of 1854, and it was possible that men might be returned having more at heart the welfare of the country. It was clear that the Governor was so far tied down by the advice he received from London. (Question, question.) He did not see why he should be insulted by hon. gentlemen continually calling “question.” He interrupted no one.¹⁸⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said the conduct of the Commissioner of Crown Lands upon this occasion was most outrageous.¹⁸⁸

MR. MACKENZIE proceeded to read from a state document the powers of the Governor in reference to his proceedings in Council, and dwelt at some length upon the arbitrary power with which the Governor was entrusted¹⁸⁹ —

DR. MASSON ... [bawled] out “carried, carried.”¹⁹⁰

MR. MACKENZIE said he never in all his life saw so disgraceful and degraded conduct in any meeting as the hon. member for Soulanges continually manifests in this House. He met the hon. gentleman when he came back from Bermuda and he looked upon him as a martyr for liberty, but when he saw him taking such a course and continually insulting members of the House, he was left no [sic] doubt very much whether the opinion he had formed of that hon. gentleman was a correct one.¹⁹¹

DR. MASSON. — You insulted us for three nights, and I think we have a right to insult you for one.¹⁹²

MR. MACKENZIE protested that he never insulted the hon. member for Soulanges in his life nor any other member — that no man was more guarded in the language he used. He used offensive language to no man — but the man who prostitutes his religion, his church and his Bible to bolster up oppression was a very proper mark for allusion by this House. The hon. gentleman then referred to the opinion entertained by the Hon. Mr. Lafontaine and others in regard to the double majority system, when he was again met by question, question. He said if hon. gentlemen had no desire to discuss the subject before them, they had better go away and await the “division bill.” He had a duty to perform to his constituents, and he would not be turned from his purpose.¹⁹³ Until we had Representation by Population, he considered that the double-majority principle was the sound one to go upon.¹⁹⁴ After some further remarks the hon. gentleman concluded by stating that he had some amendments to propose when they went into committee on supplies, but he would not trouble ... the House with [them] at present.¹⁹⁵

MR. LORANGER moved — That all the words in the amendment of the Hon. J.S. Macdonald be expunged, and the following substituted: — “That this house, in forming itself into a Committee of

the Whole, do not thereby relinquish the principle of a double majority, but merely desire to grant to her Majesty the means of defraying the expenses of the Government for the present year."¹⁹⁶

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ruled the amendment out of order, as it was contrary to usage¹⁹⁷ to go further than moving one amendment to an amendment.¹⁹⁸ It was inconvenient to do so, and if ever the precedent was established, there might be no end to amendments.¹⁹⁹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that no information had been given them on the questions he put to the Administration, as to who had advised his Excellency in the course that he took. He did not bring up this motion in the idea of getting support from the other side; for he knew that if the principle had been violated by the Government, they would still maintain them and follow the Government like a flock of sheep, although they all admitted that he was right. It made no matter who had stood by them in troublous times, when the time came that their leaders were affected away they go on a side wind to support those from whom they expect the favours. This vote to-night was a clear acknowledgement that the Metcalfe Administration, which he had joined the French Canadians in opposing, had been conducted on proper principles. He desired that they should not have an opportunity of saying that the question was not put fairly before them. He thought that they had made out the position from which he started, and that those who are going to vote against him did not repudiate the principle; but they were willing to vote against it, for the sake of their leaders. The hon. member for Lambton had accused him of trying to get over to the other side, and fearing that he might not be able to accompany him, on that occasion, had tried to make a little political capital for himself. (Applause.) He concluded by saying that the resolution proposed by the Attorney General did not meet the case.²⁰⁰

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER said that when Mr. Baldwin resigned, it was on the double majority principle. Why did not the member for Glengary, as Solicitor General, follow the example of his leader.²⁰¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — That was an isolated question.²⁰²

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — At the same time the hon. gentleman made a speech against the Chancery Court, and then voted for it, and it was said that this more than anything else determined Mr. Baldwin to resign.²⁰³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — He did not desire to have the Court swept away altogether.²⁰⁴

The motion was then put²⁰⁵.

(566)

The Honorable *John Sandfield Macdonald* moved in amendment to the said proposed Amendment, seconded by Mr. *Laberge*, That the words "the said Order of the day be postponed until Friday next" be left out, in order to insert instead thereof the words "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General representing, That by the gracious permission of Her Majesty, conveyed through Her Secretary of State for the Colonies, the system of Administration known as Responsible Government, was introduced into this Province at the time of the Union between *Upper and Lower Canada*, in 1841:

"That the principle of Responsible Government was embodied in a Resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly on the 3rd of September, 1841, on motion of the Honorable Mr. *Harrison*, the Secretary of the Province, and which received the sanction of the House, and was to the following effect: 'That in order to preserve between the different branches of the Provincial Parliament that harmony which is essential to the peace, welfare, and good government of the Province, the Chief Advisers of the Representatives of the Sovereign constituting a Provincial Administration under him, ought to be men possessed of the confidence of the Representatives of the People, thus affording a guarantee that the well understood wishes and interests of the People, which our Gracious Sovereign has declared shall be the rule of the Provincial Government, will on all occasions be faithfully represented and advocated.'

"That in order to ensure the due application of this important constitutional right to the Administration of Public Affairs in the Province, it is indispensable that the Members of the Administration selected to represent either Section of the Province, should possess the confidence of that Section to which such Members belong, and from which they have been chosen:

"That so long as this Province does not possess a Representation based on Population, but is governed by a Legislature, the popular branch of which is chosen in fixed and equal proportions from *Upper* and *Lower Canada*, it is the more imperative that each Section of the Cabinet should be able to command the confidence of the Representatives of the Section of the Province on whose behalf and for whose benefit they have been specially appointed:

(567)

"That this just principle has been virtually recognized from the first establishment of Responsible Government until now, the only exception having been in the case of Lord *Metcalfe's* Administration, when the Government of the Province was conducted upon principles completely at variance with the well understood wishes of the People of *Lower Canada*, and in the face of a powerful majority of the Representatives from that Section of the Province; this proceeding, however, was promptly repudiated and condemned by the People of *Canada* at the then next General Election, and it has not since been attempted to be carried out:

"That upon the occasion of the resignation of the Honorable *Robert Baldwin*, the Leader of the *Upper Canada* Section of the Cabinet, in 1851, upon an adverse vote of a majority of the *Upper Canadian* Representatives, relative to the abolition of the Court of Chancery, and again, in 1854, upon the resignation of the *Hincks-Morin* Administration, this constitutional principle was fully recognized, the Honorable Mr. *Hincks* stating to the House, in reference to his own retirement, that 'I felt that I could not be justified in remaining in an Administration with my colleagues from *Lower Canada*, when I could not command the confidence of the Section of the Province to which I belong:'

"That it was in conformity with this principle that the recent resignation of His Excellency's Advisers took place, and any attempt to depart from it would, in the opinion of this House, tend effectually to destroy the legitimate influence hitherto exercised by the Legislature on the Government of this Country, and would enable Her Majesty's Representative to combine with a minority of this House to compel the adoption of a system of Legislation towards one Section of the Province utterly at variance with the wants, wishes, and interests of the People inhabiting the same:

"That the *Upper Canadian* Representatives in this House having recently declared by a large majority, their extreme dissatisfaction with the recent changes in the Provincial Administration, this House would respectfully implore His Excellency to call to his Council such men from both Sections of the Province as may be able to form a strong, efficient, and united Administration, capable of carrying out a policy calculated to develop the resources, and to cherish the best interests of this noble Province, and to set at rest the many questions which await the consideration of a wise and vigorous Government, possessed of the confidence of this House, and of the Country at large;"

And the Question being put on the Amendment to the said proposed Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Biggar, Bourassa, Chapais, Cook, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Drummond, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, O'Farrell, Prévost, Southwick, and Wright.* — (15.)

(567-568)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bowes, Brown, Burton, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Christie, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Charles Daoust, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Antoine A. Dorion, Dostaler, Dufresne, Evanturel, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gould, Guévremont, Hartman, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, Munro, Papin, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding.* — (65.)

So it passed in the Negative.

MR. GAMBLE called the attention of the house to the emphatic manner in which this vote had sustained the position taken by the late Premier.²⁰⁶

MR. FERRES rose, and having assumed a very stately attitude said he wanted to put a question to the hon. member for Glengarry, and those who sat near him. He (Mr. Ferres,) had come here by a proclamation of the Governor General to do the business of the country, and he wished to know from hon. gentlemen opposite after discussing for three or four weeks, [whether] the ministry are a ministry. They were now going to have a succession of such motions so as to prevent them going on with the business.²⁰⁷

Roars of laughter, in the midst of which the House adjourned.²⁰⁸

(568)

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*,
The House adjourned until Thursday next.

Appendix

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: INVOLVEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION WITH PRIVATE COMPANIES.]

MR. FELTON a donné avis qu'il proposerait, jeudi soir, la résolution suivante: —

"Que c'est une chose incompatible avec la position officielle des hauts fonctionnaires de cette province, et avec le dû accomplissement de leurs devoirs, en même temps que nuisible aux intérêts publics, qu'un membre du conseil exécutif, un orateur de l'une ou l'autre chambre du parlement ou un solliciteur-général, soit président, directeur, secrétaire, agent, procureur, solliciteur ou entrepreneur d'une compagnie incorporée de chemin de fer, de banque ou autre, agisse comme tel, ou reçoive directement ou indirectement paiement d'aucune semblable compagnie pour quelques services que ce soit, ou spéculé, ou commerce avec les fonds, débetures ou bons du gouvernement de cette province, ou d'aucune corporation municipale de cette province."²⁰⁹

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: MOTIONS AND VOTES OF NON-CONFIDENCE.]

MR. DUFRESNE donne avis qu'il proposera, vendredi prochain, que la chambre se forme en comité général dans la vue [sic] d'adopter les résolutions suivantes:

"1. Résolu, — Qu'à l'avenir toutes propositions de non-confiance dans l'administration du pays devront être faites lors de la discussion sur l'adresse de la chambre d'assemblée en réponse au discours du trône lors de l'ouverture de chaque session.

"2. Résolu, — Qu'après l'adoption finale de la réponse de la chambre au discours du trône, aucun vote de la chambre d'assemblée ne sera censé impliquer un manque de confiance dans l'administration, et toute proposition directe de non-confiance, après l'adoption de telle adresse, sera hors d'ordre."²¹⁰

[DISCUSSION RE: CLAIMS OF JOHN COUNTER.]

MR. CONGER moved the appointment of a Committee of five members to enquire into and report upon all the circumstances attending the non-fulfilment and abandonment of the contract entered into

by John Counter, Esq., with the Commissioners of Public Works for the construction of the Junction Canal on the St. Lawrence, with power to send for persons and papers.²¹¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD would like to know was that the way the Government was going to get rid of the responsibility of this question; by getting new members like the hon. member for Peterboro to make such a motion.²¹²

MR. PATRICK hoped that the hon. member for Glengary would bottle up his fury. In his (Mr. P.'s) opinion, the House ought to grant the Committee.²¹³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD trusted the hon. member for Glengary would abide by the advice that he had received. The hon. gentleman then entered into a detail of the circumstances of the case of Mr. Counter. He asserted that it was a matter of no consequence to the Government whether the house granted this Committee or not. If the house thought it should be granted, the Government had no objection.²¹⁴

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria) was glad that the Government did not oppose the appointment of the Committee. Enquiry should be had into the matter.²¹⁵

MR. CONGER hoped that the hon. member for Glengary would now be satisfied, and allow the motion to go on.²¹⁶

MR. J.S. MACDONALD. — No, indeed I will not.²¹⁷

MR. CONGER. — It was only just to Mr. Counter that this matter should be taken up, and he trusted that the motion would be agreed to.²¹⁸

MR. A. DORION. — It was something singular that the head of the Government should court enquiry in this matter, when the Commissioner of Public Works had reported against it.²¹⁹

The attention of the Speaker was called to the fact that the motion was taken up out of its order, and, as it was objected to, it was declared out of order.²²⁰

Footnotes

1. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
2. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
3. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
4. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
10. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856. *Globe*, 4 June 1856, summarizes this speech in the following manner: "Dr. Fortier in very warm language, accused the last speaker of desiring to stir up a revolution and to excite a civil war between the two sections of the Province. (Laughter.)"
11. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.

12. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
13. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
14. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
15. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856, reports that this Message was dated 22 May 1856. *Globe*, 5 June 1856, and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 14 June 1856, report short commentaries regarding the Governor General's recommendation.
18. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
30. *Globe*, 4 June 1856, reports that this motion was made by Mr. Cartier, "in absence of Mr. Somerville".
31. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856, reports that 49 members voted against the amendment, but does not provide a list of voters.
32. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
36. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
37. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
38. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856. This account concurs with the *Journals*, whereas *Globe*, 4 June 1856, mistakenly reports that the motion was made by Mr. Cayley.
39. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
40. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
42. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
43. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
44. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
45. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
46. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
47. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.
48. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
49. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
50. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
51. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
52. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
53. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
54. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
55. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
56. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
57. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
58. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
59. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
60. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
61. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
62. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
63. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
64. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.

65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
66. *Ibid.*
67. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
69. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
70. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
78. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
79. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
80. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
81. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
82. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
83. *Ibid.*
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*
86. *Ibid.*
87. *Ibid.*
88. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
89. *Ibid.*
90. *Globe*, 4 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856, reports that Mr. Marchildon “made some humorous remarks in regard to the propriety of going on with the business of the country.”
91. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
92. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
93. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
94. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
95. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
96. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
97. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
98. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
99. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
100. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
101. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
102. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
103. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
104. *Globe*, 4 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856, reports that Mr. J.A. Macdonald said he intended to make this motion “on Friday next, if he retained his seat so long”.
105. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
106. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
107. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
108. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856 (in Scrapbook Hansard). This source was used as the identical sentence in *Globe*, 4 June 1856, is partly illegible.
109. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
110. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
111. *Ibid.*
112. *Ibid.*
113. *Ibid.*
114. *Ibid.*
115. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.
116. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
117. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.

118. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
119. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.
120. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
121. *Ibid.*
122. *Ibid.*
123. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.
124. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Ibid.*
127. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.
128. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
129. *Montreal Gazette*, 7 June 1856.
130. *Globe*, 5 June 1856. The ellipsis represents illegible words.
131. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*
134. *Ibid.*
135. *Ibid.*
136. *Ibid.*
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Ibid.*
139. *Ibid.*
140. *Ibid.*
141. *Ibid.*
142. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
143. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
144. *Ibid.*
145. *Ibid.*
146. *Ibid.*
147. *Globe*, 5 June 1856. The ellipsis represents an illegible word.
148. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
149. *Ibid.*
150. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
151. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Ibid.*
154. *Ibid.*
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
157. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
158. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
159. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
160. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
161. *Ibid.*
162. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
163. *Ibid.*
164. *Ibid.*
165. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
166. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
167. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
168. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
169. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
170. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
171. *Ibid.*
172. *Ibid.*
173. *Ibid.*

174. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
175. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
176. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
177. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
178. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
179. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
180. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
181. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
182. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856. This newspaper does not specify whether the speaker was Mr. A. Dorion or Mr. J. Dorion.
183. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
184. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
185. *Ibid.*
186. *Ibid.*
187. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
188. *Ibid.*
189. *Ibid.*
190. *Ibid.*
191. *Ibid.*
192. *Ibid.*
193. *Ibid.*
194. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
195. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
196. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
197. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
198. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
199. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
200. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
201. *Ibid.*
202. *Ibid.*
203. *Ibid.*
204. *Ibid.*
205. *Globe*, 5 June 1856. In a commentary, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856, reports that the vote was taken at midnight. Other commentaries on this debate are reported in *Globe*, 4 June 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856, *Western Planet*, 5 June 1856, *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 6 June 1856, *Le Pays*, 7 June 1856, and *Montreal Transcript*, 9 June 1856.
206. *Globe*, 5 June 1856.
207. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 5 June 1856.
208. *Ibid.*
209. *Le Pays*, 7 June 1856. This newspaper does not specify the date this notice was put down on the notice list.
210. *Le Pays*, 5 June 1856, *idem*.
211. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
212. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 4 June 1856.
213. *Globe*, 4 June 1856.
214. *Ibid.*
215. *Ibid.*
216. *Ibid.*
217. *Ibid.*
218. *Ibid.*
219. *Ibid.*
220. *Ibid.*

THURSDAY, 5 JUNE 1856

(568)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table: —

By the Honorable Mr. *Cayley*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of *Goderich*.

By Mr. *Guévremont*, — The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of *La Visitation de L'Isle du Pads*.

By Mr. *Supple*, — The Petition of *Alexander Moffatt* and others, of the County of *Renfrew*.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read: —

Of *Benjamin Soules* and others, of the Township of *Saltfleet*; and of *J.K. Vernon* and others, of the Township of *Scott*; praying that Representation may be based upon Population.

Of *J.O. Labranche* and others, of *Metgermette* and other Townships, County of *Beauce*; of *Ambroise Morin*, Mayor, and others, of the Parish of *St. François*, County of *Beauce*; of the Reverend *A. Campeau* and others, of the Parish of *St. Georges d'Aubert Gallion*, County of *Beauce*; and of *Zéphirin Bertrand* and others, of *T[r]ing* and other Townships, County of *Beauce*; praying that the Parish of *St. François* may be made the chief place of the Judiciary District of *Beauce*.

Of the Municipality of the Township of *Greenock*; praying for certain amendments to the Assessment Law of *Upper Canada*.

Of *William Sykes*, of the City of *Toronto*; praying that a Bill may be passed to bring into operation the *Carillon* and *Grenville* Section of the *Montreal* and *Bytown* Railway.

Of Messieurs *Benson* and Company, and others, of the Counties of *Levis* and *Dorchester*, and other places; praying for aid to construct a Bridge over the River *Chaudière*.

Mr. *Sanborn*, from the Select Committee appointed to inquire as to the best means of suppressing the vice of Drunkenness, and other references, with power to report from time to time, presented to the House the First Report of the said Committee; which was read.

For the said Report, see Appendix (No. 62.)

MR. TURCOTTE called the attention of the house to a breach of privilege. He found on the notice paper the following notice by Mr. Darche: — "That the following article be added to the Rules of this house and form part thereof: At the time of taking the vote on any question before the house, no Member of the Administration shall be permitted to cabal with, visit and canvass the members then present, to induce them, by promises or otherwise, to vote in favour of the Government." (Great laughter.) Hon. gentlemen might laugh, but he appealed to them whether such language could be tolerated, whether they should disgrace their printed proceedings by allowing to stand on them a notice purporting that the members of this house could be bribed and in fact were bribed, by promises and otherwise, by the Government.¹ He was not willing to let such a notice pass without recording his vote against it. Such a notice was, he thought, an insult to the House and a breach of its privileges. He should therefore move: "That the notice placed on the list of notices of motion of the 3rd June by the hon. member for Chambly, be expunged from the list of said notices — being a gross breach of the privileges of this House and an insult to its members."²

[The motion was] seconded by MR. DUFRESNE.³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD asked if the motion was in order.⁴ [He] did not see that ... [Mr. Darche's notice] was a breach of privilege or an insult to the House.⁵

MR. ROBINSON suggested that the hon. member for Glengarry was, no doubt, expecting to cross the floor and [did] not want to have his hands tied.⁶

MR. J.S. MACDONALD would maintain that the course taken by the hon. member for Maskinonge was unprecedented. Its only effect would be to gag members of the House. It was perfectly competent for any hon. gentleman in that house to rise up in his place and move a vote of want of confidence in any member of the Administration, or in it as a whole. In taking this course, the hon. member for Maskinonge was in effect endeavoring to stifle public opinion. The motion of the hon. member for Chamblay [sic] merely said that the Administration should not do so, not that they had done so. That there was a coloving [sic] for such a notice, however, was evidenced by the conduct of a certain hon. gentleman during the last want of confidence debate⁷. Had they not seen a member rising in his place, and saying he would vote against the ministry, when one of the ministry took him by the collar into an ante-room, and a few minutes afterwards, he voted for the Government? The Government were notoriously guilty of such practices.⁸ Now he thought the House was just as much entitled to whatever information was then communicated, as the hon. member in question. It was, too, a frequent occurrence to see the members of the Administration, one after another, leave their places, and scatter themselves over the house, when they saw the current setting in against them. He would maintain that [the notice of] the hon. member for Chamblay [sic] was neither an insult to the House nor a breach of its privileges.⁹ It would be unfair to the member for Chamblay to strike off his notice, in his absence.¹⁰

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that the question of privilege remained with the House¹¹. [He] read a standing rule of the House of Commons, that "any notice containing unbecoming expressions will be liable to be expunged from the notice paper, by order of the house." It was for the house to decide whether the expressions used were unbecoming or not.¹²

MR. TURCOTTE read an instance of a notice of a motion having been expunged from the notice-paper of the English House of Commons in June, 1835.¹³

MR. A. DORION could not see anything in the motion offensive to the members of the Administration. It was well known that many opinions were expressed as to the propriety of the members of the Government sitting in the House. Now, suppose, the motion were to be raised and he were to move that the sitting of the members of the Administration in the House, was injurious to the proper deliberations of the House, would any member say that would be a breach of the privileges of the House? (No, no.) In his opinion, there was no difference between the two motions. If one was correct, so was the other.¹⁴ He believed, however, that his hon. friend would probably withdraw his notice, if he were in his place, and he hoped the member for Maskinonge would withdraw his motion.¹⁵

MR. TURCOTTE. — No! I want to inflict the censure of the house on Mr. Darche.¹⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the motion of the hon. member for Chamblay, was not only an assertion that hon. members in that House were bribed, but that the members of the Government bribed them; which was altogether unfounded. But this motion left the ministry power to act thus before the vote was taken. (Laughter.) In his opinion it was a most improper and unparliamentary notice. He hoped the hon. member for Maskinonge would persist in his motion to expunge it¹⁷. It was not enough to withdraw the notice, but something should be done to prevent the recurrence of any thing of the kind.¹⁸

MR. POWELL trusted the hon. member for Maskinonge would persist in his motion; although the motion of the hon. member for Chamblay was so absurd, that condemnation was almost unnecessary. But¹⁹ [he] agreed that it was due to the dignity of the house that they should mark their sense of the

absurdity of the notice, by striking it out — and more especially, when it had been defended by the member for Glengary and the member for Montreal.²⁰

MR. A. DORION begged to inform the hon. member for Carleton, that he (Mr. Dorion) had not defended the notice. He merely asked the hon. member for Maskinonge to postpone his motion until the hon. member for Chambly had taken his place, and had explained his notice.²¹

MR. POWELL was glad that the hon. member had not defended such a course of procedure. With reference to the question raised by that hon. member, respecting the propriety of ministers occupying a seat in the House, he (Mr. Powell) would be prepared when the question came up, to record his vote [sic] against the custom of ministers taking a seat in the House; for the influence they could exercise therein, would neither be beneficial to the House nor the country.²²

MR. WILSON would be sorry to see this notice go before the committee, for it was due to the dignity of the House that it should not appear. But hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches should recollect that they had brought it on themselves. Had not the House witnessed those hon. gentlemen, time after time, doing the very thing condemned in this resolution, when their extreme necessity required it? (Hear, hear.) Could any hon. gentleman rise up in his place, and assert he had not seen them do it?²³ They had done all that was charged. (Hear, hear.)²⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — I have not seen them do so. (Laughter.)²⁵

MR. WILSON. — The hon. Solicitor General may assert that he has not seen it, but at all events, he has been seen doing it. (Laughter.) It was one of these things which seemed to have arisen out of the necessity of the times; and he hoped the present motion would act as a caution to hon. gentlemen opposite to be more guarded in future, and not act in a manner which gave ground for suspicion. If such conduct were to be carried on, surely it ought not to be inside the House.²⁶

MR. MERRITT said it appeared to him that they were fated to fritter away the present session in violent and useless controversies²⁷, and the last gentleman who should have noticed this notice of motion being down was the hon. member for Maskinonge.²⁸ The notice ought not, in his opinion, to be expunged.²⁹ Such notices ought to be let alone and not be allowed to occupy the attention of the house. Was there a precedent in Canada for such a motion as that of the hon. member for Maskinonge being introduced?³⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied that there was such a precedent, where a motion was brought forward in 1835.³¹

MR. MERRITT was not aware of such a precedent. But even suppose there were, there was not in this instance the least necessity for its exercise. No person, with the exception of hon. members themselves, would ever take the trouble of reading those notices; hence it was perfectly harmless.³²

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said that if the motion were correct in principle it should apply to the opposition as well as to the administration. During the recent debate, he recollected seeing the hon. member for Glengary very busy along the back range of seats, talking with hon. gentlemen — of course, he was not aware what proposals the hon. gentleman might have made.³³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD replied that the Opposition had no patronage at *their* disposal. (Hear, hear.)³⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH would repeat that so far as his observation went, the hon. member for Glengary showed greater anxiety on that occasion than any member of the administration. With

respect to the notice papers, he would maintain that they had a very extensive circulation, and such a notice as that of the hon. member for Chambly being inserted in them, would have a very injurious effect. The hon. member for Maskinonge deserved the thanks of the House for such a motion.³⁵

MR. LABERGE thought that such a motion was an insult to the house as well as to the Government. (Hear, hear.) Let other people blame them, but hon. members should not disgrace themselves by letting it go to foreign Governments, that Canadian ministers are corrupt. If the hon. member for Chambly was now absent it was his own fault.³⁶

CAPT. RHODES said it was rather unfair to bring up this matter in the absence of the hon. member for Chambly. Nor did the hon. gentleman's motion seem to be wholly groundless, for during the course of the recent debate, the late Attorney General East stated that while in office he never followed the practice of soliciting votes for any of his measures. But he (Mr. R[h]odes,) could not see how the motion was improper; and hoped the House would allow the hon. gentleman giving the notice an opportunity of explaining his motives.³⁷

MR. BELLINGHAM said the hon. member for Chambly was bound to be in his place in the House, for if he has put such a notice upon the paper, he must have had some facts in his mind to induce him to do so. It was not likely that he would have stated that inducements might be held out unless he was aware that they had been in some special case. The hon. member for Glengarry had alluded to a particular case, he had no hesitation in saying that he had alluded to himself (Mr. Bellingham.) He was, however, prepared to meet any charge which might be brought against him. It was exceedingly awkward to be charged with having received large bribes for voting in a particular way, when in point of fact he had never received one penny.³⁸

MR. LORANGER said it was an insult to the House, as well as to the Government, to have such a notice put upon the paper. Other people might blame them, but they should be careful not to disgrace themselves. They should especially be careful not to allow it to go to foreign countries that ministers are corrupt. If the hon. member for Chambly was absent it was his own business — he ought to have been present. It was not a matter of courtesy at all, because corruption was charged in distinct terms.³⁹

MR. SANBORN was astonished at the hon. member for Carl[e]ton, stating that the Opposition were retarding the business of the country. He did not know in what particular position the hon. member for Carl[e]ton wished to stand — he was now voting with the Opposition, although he might not consider himself a member of the Opposition proper. He (Mr. Sanborn) did not see why the Government needed to be so particularly sensitive upon this occasion. He could not understand why they had got one of their supporters to take up this notice while they had taken no action upon a previous notice of motion far more injurious in its tendency than the present [one]. Why had they allowed such a notice as that of the hon. member for Kent to remain upon the paper. That hon. member gave notice more than a month ago to the following effect: — "Mr. Larwill, on Monday next, will move an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, a Return of the number of all Negro or Colored Male or Female, Quadroon, Mulatto, Samboes, Half-breeds or Mules, Mongrels or Conglomerates, in the Penitentiary, Lunatic Asylum, or other Public Institutions, as also the proportion of those curious classes or varieties of the Provincial population as compared with the Celt and Saxon Races⁴⁰; and for a list of all appointments to military or civil employment from amongst the coloured population of the Province; also for copies of all correspondence between the Government and the coloured population of the Province relative to their continued absence from the jury list."⁴¹ (Laughter.) Why was it that the ministers were so sensitive upon the notice of motion of the hon. member for Chambly being [laid] down, when they had not objected to the previous notice which reflected contemptuously upon the coloured people in the Province? (Hear, hear.)⁴² The motion quoted by the hon. member for Maskinonge,

was one intended to burlesque the House, and this motion of the hon. member for Kent was evidently intended to burlesque that whole section of the community of this Province. As a class they were entitled to equal rights with ourselves. He thought the ministers altogether too sensitive. They should at least have had some gratitude for the hon. member for Chambly, the man who had given them the best suggestion — in fact the only original suggestion they ever brought forward. They ought to evince their gratitude by waiting till he makes his appearance in the House to defend himself. If he has no facts to fall back upon, then let him take the responsibility of bringing up such a question, and if he cannot substantiate his position let the motion be voted down.⁴³

MR. TURCOTTE said to ridicule [sic] the House was one thing, but to insult them by charging them with corruption was another, although the motion was made by a private of the army, it was very likely that it was dictated by one of the generals.⁴⁴ [The notice] would be circulated throughout the country, and when the public should see it in the newspapers they must think the whole house corrupt, and purchaseable. It was plainly a breach of the privileges of Parliament, and ought to be so regarded. The members of the Opposition seemed to think that all the virtue of patriots is confined to their side of the house. Mr. Patrick remarked the other evening that he would rather beg his daily bread than resort to the practice so common of soliciting support to Ministerial schemes among the members of this house. When that hon. gentleman found it necessary to make such an observation he must have felt the degrading nature of the practice referred to.⁴⁵

DR. MASSON took the opportunity of saying that the public report about his having been bought by the government was incorrect. He had received a sum of £530 on account of some claims for damages on the Beauharnois Canal, but it was a simple matter of justice.⁴⁶

MR. HOLTON was not prepared to declare the notice a breach of privilege, and did not approve of the motion. He would suggest to the hon. member for Maskinonge a motion merely to expunge the notice.⁴⁷

MR. TURCOTTE persisted in maintaining his own motion.⁴⁸

MR. A. DORION moved to amend the said motion by leaving out all the words after list, in the fifth line of the original motion.⁴⁹

SIR A. MACNAB said the notice in question was, without doubt, an insult to the house; but he was not prepared to treat it as a breach of privilege. If there had been any such purchase of a vote as that referred to, the proper course was for the Opposition to bring it forward supported by proof, and the Minister so offending would be liable to impeachment.⁵⁰ But the House should not assume that any members of the House were thus treated with. He had no objection to move that the motion be expunged from the notice paper.⁵¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) agreed with the hon. and gallant knight. He, however, did not know but that the hon. member for Chambly was actually in possession of proofs which would inculpate some particular member.⁵² [He] would like to know how the matter would be treated, suppose the gentleman ... should state that he was prepared by instances to justify his motion. As the original mover was absent, he would still press forward the motion.⁵³

SIR A. MACNAB considered the original motion an insult to the House. If members thought that the Ministry were acting corrupt, let a direct charge be made against them.⁵⁴

MR. A. DORION said that his motion provided for all this. The amendment by Mr. Turcotte imposed a severe check on the member for Chambly — who was not now in his place. This he strongly condemned.⁵⁵

MR. LORANGER thought it should appear on the journals of the House *why* this notice had been expunged. He would therefore suggest, that in addition thereto, it should be qualified as a scandalous violation of parliamentary privilege.⁵⁶ He had a motion in amendment to Mr. Dorion's, which he would move when the right time came.⁵⁷

After some further discussion the amendment was put⁵⁸.

(568) Mr. *Turcotte* moved, seconded by Mr. *Dufresne*, and the Question being proposed, That the Notice placed on the List of Notices of Motions, on the 3rd of June instant, by Mr. *Darche*, Member for the County of *Chambly*, be expunged from the List, the said Notice being a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an insult to its Members;

(569) Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *Holton*, That the words "the said Notice being a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an insult to its Members" be left out;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Bourassa, Bureau, Christie, Cook, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Rhodes, James Ross, Sanborn, Scatcherd, James Smith, Southwick, Valois, Wilson, and Wright.* — (27.)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Biggar, Bowes, Burton, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Evanturel, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Prévost, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding.* — (59.)

So it passed in the Negative.

And the Question being again proposed, That the Notice placed on the List of Notices of Motions, on the 3rd of June instant, by Mr. *Darche*, Member for the County of *Chambly*, be expunged from the List, the said Notice being a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an insult to its Members;

MR. LORANGER moved, in amendment to Mr. Turcotte's motion, that the words "a gross breach of the privileges of this House, &c.," be left out, and that the words "its members" be also left out, and the words "the members of the House" added at the end thereof.⁵⁹

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) moved in amendment to the previous amendment: "That all the words after 'that' in the said amendment be expunged, and the following substituted: 'it is inexpedient to declare any opinion on the following words which form the substance of the said notice, viz:'.⁶⁰ "That the following article be added to the rules of this House to form part thereof: — At the time of taking the vote on any question before the House, no member of the Administration shall be permitted to cabal with, visit and canvass the Members then present, to induce them by promise or otherwise, to vote in favor of the Government,"⁶¹ until the hon. member now absent from his seat shall have an opportunity, in due course, of explaining his reasons for placing said notice on the paper.'⁶² He was sorry to move that amendment, but as it was desired to put on the record a charge of some great offence against the member for Chambly, it was necessary that a statement of what the offence was should go with the censure.⁶³

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that no verbal explanation was necessary to enable the house to say whether the notice was offensive or not.⁶⁴ The hon. member could not move that it be

expunged, without considering that it was an improper one; and, therefore, he should not move that it be left on the notice paper. If it was improper it ought to be removed at once.⁶⁵

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary). — The members on the opposition side of the house had acted with candour in this matter, and were willing to expunge the notice complained of. But the hon. member for Maskinonge is not satisfied with that course. It was manifestly unfair to pass a censure on an absent member, who had enjoyed no opportunity to explain the notice he had given.⁶⁶

MR. MACKENZIE spoke in favor of the member for Chambly. He said that it was the duty of the Opposition to watch the Government, and see that they did not exceed their power. Therefore he did not see why the present motion could ... be considered an insult in any way — seeing that it only took measures to keep members of the Governmen[t] in order. There are a great many statutes upon keeping the Government from doing wrong. An insult was something done deliberately to injure or vex another person, and this could not be considered in such a light.⁶⁷ It ought, however, to be expunged, as it is desirable to maintain the character of the Legislature, and not to impugn it without strong grounds. Because a motion may not be written exactly in accordance with the views of the members of the house generally, that is not a reason to affix a stigma to the name of⁶⁸ the member for Chambly which might descend even to his children.⁶⁹ He was willing to expunge the notice, because he saw it was offensive to several of the members; but he could not agree to the whole motion without giving the gentleman who had put this notice on the paper an opportunity of explaining the reasons which had induced him to do so.⁷⁰ The House should not expose the hon. member, or insult him as Mr. Turcotte's amendment would do.⁷¹

MR. WILSON asked if the member for Maskinonge would consent to strike out the latter part of his motion.⁷²

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said a motion for that purpose had been already voted down.⁷³

MR. WILSON asked if he would not consent to strike it out.⁷⁴

MR. TURCOTTE. — No.⁷⁵

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that if the motion before the chair were put, the obnoxious words in the notice would appear on the journals; and suggested that some understanding might be arrived at by which that might [be] avoided.⁷⁶

MR. HOLTON said that the object of the friends of Mr. Darche was to cause to appear on the journals the reason for the notice, as the member for Maskinonge would not consent to withdraw the latter part of his motion.⁷⁷

MR. TURCOTTE had no objection to the whole appearing on the journals.⁷⁸

SIR A. MACNAB thought hon. gentlemen opposite could scarcely understand the effect of the amendment, or they would frame it differently.⁷⁹

MR. HOLTON said it was understood perfectly.⁸⁰

The amendment was [then] put⁸¹.

(569)

Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. Holton, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "it is inexpedient to declare any opinion on the following words which form the substance of the said Notice,

namely: — 'That the following article be added to the Rules of this House to form part thereof: At the time of taking the Vote on any Question before the House, no Member of the Administration shall be permitted to cabal with, visit and canvass the Members then present, to induce them by promise or otherwise to vote in favor of the Government;' until the Honorable Member, now absent from his seat, shall have an opportunity in due course of explaining his reasons for placing such Notice on the List of Notices of Motions" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

(569-570)

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Bourassa, Bureau, Christie, Cook, Antoine A. Dorion, Fellowes, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Prévost, Sanborn, Scatcherd, James Smith, Southwick, Valois, Wilson, and Wright.* — (28.)

(570)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Biggar, Bowes, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Dufresne, Evanturel, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, Polette, Pouliot, Powell, Rhodes, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Taché, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding.* — (56.)⁸²

So it passed in the Negative.

And the Question being again proposed, That the Notice placed on the List of Notices of Motions, on the 3rd June instant, by Mr. *Darche*, Member for the County of *Chambly*, be expunged from the List, the said Notice being a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an insult to its Members;

MR. SANBORN then moved an amendment to the effect that if the notice of the hon. member for Chambly were expunged, so also should the notice given by the member for Kent on the second of May last,⁸³ viz: — "Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House a return of the number of all negro or colored male and female, quadroon, mulatto, sambos, half-breeds or mules, mongrels or conglomerates [sic] in the Penitentiary, Lunatic Asylum or other public institutions, as also the proportion of these curious classes or varieties of the Provincial population as compared with the Celt or Saxon races," as a gross insult to the dignity of this House.⁸⁴ He explained his object in offering the amendment to be for the purpose of showing that the notice of an address on this subject by the member for Kent, was a gross insult to the dignity of the house, as well as an insult to the classes alluded to; and he wished to stamp it with reprobation. Language was used in that address which had never before been applied to them, to burlesque particular classes of society.⁸⁵ The words there used, were not, in fact, applicable to human beings.⁸⁶ He said that he left the last words [in his motion] as the member for Maskinonge had proposed.⁸⁷ The censure he desired to put on the books was exactly in accordance with English precedents, and as members had so high a sense of their honor and dignity, no doubt they would be obliged to him for giving them an opportunity for maintaining them.⁸⁸ He objected to the way in which the member for Maskinonge had made this motion, without giving notice of it, and when Mr. Darche was known to be absent from town; and he objected to the language used by that member when urging his motion. His language was a gross insult to the house, when he said that Mr. Darche was not capable of writing his notice. If he had desired merely to expunge the notice, there would have been some reason in his motion; but he had gone further than that, and cast reproach and censure on a gentleman who was absent, without stating the reason.⁸⁹

MR. LARWILL considered the discussion which had taken place a greater insult to the intelligence of the House and country, than the motion of the hon. member for Chambly.⁹⁰ He put it to the common

sense of the house whether he had been fairly dealt with by uniting his motion of great and national importance with the trifling affair before the house. He held it to be quite inconsistent with reason, or common sense, that one man could insult another except they are equals, that an individual could insult a whole body, and therefore Mr. Darche could not by any possibility insult the house. The discussion then was absurd in the extreme, and he had not anticipated that his notice for an address woule [sic] be joined with it. He conceived himself to be perfectly justified in giving that notice on high philosophical and national grounds.⁹¹ By that motion he called for a return of the colored population in the Lunatic Asylum. And he would state his reason for so doing.⁹² The southern slaveholders are compelled to support their infirm, lunatic, and idiot slaves until decease,⁹³ but instead of doing so, they, in order to avoid that law, commission some of their agents to take those persons who are no longer able to toil for them, to Canada⁹⁴, where they are welcomed and then established permanently in some of our public institutions;⁹⁵ and the people of this Province, in their philanthropy, are obliged to sustain these unfortunates. Was not that a question worthy the most serious consideration of the House and the country? Then, again, he asked a return of the colored inmates at the Penitentiary, an institution containing, as he had stated on a former occasion, one in every 700 Americans in the Province, one in every 3,000 Upper Canadians, and one in every 7,000 Lower Canadians. Now a great injustice was done to the Americans inhabiting this Province, by such a statement, for it did not specify the number of colored Americans in that institution, who were largely in excess of the whites. Now, when the hon. member for Haldimand and himself were in the Penitentiary (loud laughter) — they had visited that institution together — they saw that it contained a large number of colored people. That circumstance was easily accounted for by the fact that the colored people coming over here are the worst class of those inhabiting the States. They were not at all to be looked upon as a fair average of the colored people.⁹⁶ When his notice came up in its proper order for discussion, he would be able to show that he had an object in view, and he would then convince Mr. Sanborn that he had not used language which is not perfectly applicable and correct. That gentleman seemed to think that some of the terms are not recognized — a Sambo, for instance⁹⁷. He [Mr. Larwill] would say, that there were such “varieties” of the colored race, as he had indicated⁹⁸, [and] he would be able to show that they are classified by naturalists in learned books which that gentleman has perhaps never read.⁹⁹

A Member. — What’s a Sambo?¹⁰⁰

MR. LARWILL could assure the hon. member that there was such a variety as a Sambo. (Laughter.) And had the hon. member for Compton read any works on the types and varieties of mankind, he would not have cavilled at his motion. (Laughter.) A “Sambo” is a cross between a Negro and an Indian. (Loud laughter.)¹⁰¹ Mr. Sanborn might be assured of that, and the other terms were perfectly applicable and correct.¹⁰² When the question came fairly before the House, he would be fully prepared to defend his course in making that motion. As regards the colored population generally, he felt convinced that he only gave utterance to the sentiments of that House, in saying that in regard to their social, civil, or political position, they can never be identified with the white population. (Hear, hear.) Had any of them ever been raised to the dignity of the magistracy? — were any of them appointed militia officers? — or had they, in fact, been placed on an equality with the other inhabitants of the Province? No such thing. Years ago, before these colored people came into the country, he had taken the ground that they were not a desirable race — (laughter) — that the Government was doing an injustice to the country by incorporating the Elgin Institution, and other similar institutions — giving the negroes a preemption. Nor did he act unreasonably in so doing. He knew that if any of his relatives on the other side of the Atlantic were diseased or disabled, they were prohibited from coming here. And were American slaves and southern serfs, to be allowed to do so? Were they to be permitted to swarm over here, filling our jails, penitentiaries, and charitable institutions — thus adding to the burdens and taxations of the Province? Were they to encourage the emigration of a race of people with whom they had no feelings in common, and discourage the emigration of their relatives, friends and countrymen? The colored population differed essentially

from the white; and where such difficulties at present exist, were they still further to increase these difficulties by the introduction of a third race, still more distinct?¹⁰³

[The House then adjourned for the afternoon recess.]

After the recess,¹⁰⁴

MR. FOLEY regretted that hon. gentlemen on the ministerial side should have taken up so much time, unnecessarily, at this late period of the Session, in the discussion of this question. The question for the House to decide was, whether the hon. member introducing the motion originally, had not some reason for it. And the fact was that the Government had themselves acknowledged that they did exercise this practice. In proof of this the hon. gentleman quoted the speeches of the Inspector General and Sir Allan MacNab¹⁰⁵, [showing] that, on their own confession, the Government had strained every nerve to secure votes on the occasion of the recent vote of want of confidence¹⁰⁶. The former hon. gentleman [Mr. Cayley] confessed to having asked the hon. and gallant knight to use his influence with the hon. members for Toronto and Hastings, in order to induce them to withhold their votes of want of confidence. The Inspector General also stated that the Government, on that occasion, used every influence with members of the House, to change their votes.¹⁰⁷ The hon. member for Chambly perhaps thought it was wrong for members of the Government to put forth such exertions in order¹⁰⁸ to prevent a vote which risked their seats. The hon. and gallant knight also stated that on that occasion every influence had been exerted in order to prevent that vote — thus influencing hon. members to vote against their convictions. Now, he (Mr. Foley) was not prepared to say that in so doing the Government had acted wrongly, but it was quite possible his hon. friend from Chambly might be of a very different opinion, and if so, the hon. gentleman had a right to say so, without being charging [sic] with insulting the House thereby. In putting this notice on the paper, the hon. member for Chambly was merely bringing under the notice of the House, facts, which by the showing of the Government themselves, were in existence.¹⁰⁹

MR. LARWILL intimated his willingness to withdraw his notice of motion, having reference to the coloured population, which formed the subject of Mr. Sanborn's amendment. (No! no!)¹¹⁰

MR. BELLINGHAM said, the house had been appealed to *ad misericordiam* on behalf of the member for Chambly, and been told that it was unfair to expunge his notice in his absence. Now, what would the House think when they learned that the hon. member had been in the passage, within reach of this debate —¹¹¹

A voice: How long?¹¹²

[MR. BELLINGHAM continued:] — but acting on the advice of some hon. gentlemen opposite, he had not taken his seat. (No, no. Order, order.)¹¹³

MR. J. DORION said that he and Mr. Darche had just arrived from Buffalo, not five minutes ago. (Hear, hear.)¹¹⁴

MR. BELLINGHAM. — Why is he not here?¹¹⁵

MR. PAPIN. — The House having refused to accede to the request to wait for the hon. gentleman, no member had a right to rise in his place and ask such a question.¹¹⁶

MR. BELLINGHAM went on to vindicate himself from the insinuation that he had altered the vote he had intended to give on a recent occasion at the solicitation of the Government. He appealed to the

members of the Opposition whether by one expression of his he had given them to understand that he intended to vote with them (the Opposition).¹¹⁷

MR. PAPIN. — The hon. member did give us so to understand by his speech.¹¹⁸

MR. BELLINGHAM. — The hon. gentleman does not understand the spirit of the English language. (Oh! oh!) And if any one means to assert that I was induced by any personal consideration to vote contrary to what I considered the welfare of the country, I say he is guilty of an incorrect statement.¹¹⁹

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said that the matter before the House resolved itself into this — shall the motion be expunged, and shall the notice be considered an insult to the House.¹²⁰ The general feeling of the house was in favour of the amendment of the member for Laprairie, which proposed to strike out the declaration that the notice was a breach of privilege. But the member for Compton (Mr. Sanborn) wished both notices, that of Mr. Larwill and that of Mr. Darche to be considered breaches of privilege. There was no analogy between the two notices. That of the member for Chambly had reference to the conduct of members of this house, while that of the member for Kent had reference to a certain class of the population. And no one who had heard the member for Kent this evening could deny that he had shown a good deal of ability, and deserved some attention in bringing the matter before Parliament. And he (the Solicitor General) did not think the object of the motion was to hurt the feelings of the coloured population, but to obtain some useful and valuable information.¹²¹ He reminded hon. gentlemen that the result of the motion of the hon. member for Compton was to make out the notice of Mr. Larwill a breach of privilege — and it was admitted on all hands that it was not. As to the motion of the hon. member for Chambly, he could only say that it was given indiscre[e]tly.¹²² But, if Mr. Sanborn's amendment were adopted, it would be equivalent to saying that both members had been guilty of a breach of privilege.¹²³

MR. SANBORN explained that his motion was in amendment to that of the member for Laprairie, and if carried would not involve that either member had been guilty of a breach of privilege. But if Mr. Darche's resolution was to be expunged, he desired that the same rule should be applied to Mr. Larwill's, which was much more worthy of censure. He thought that if the house was inclined to take a partial view of these motions before it, and to shelter the hon. member for Kent, it was very unjust.¹²⁴

MR. LARWILL stated that as regards his motion he was quite willing to withdraw it.¹²⁵

MR. J. DORION (Arthabaska) defended his friend, the member for Chambly. That hon. gentleman had arrived in town this evening, and was coming to the House to make his explanations, but when he (Mr. D.) heard that the House had shown itself unwilling to await his coming he persuaded him along with other friends not to come. His absence had been unfairly commented on by hon. gentlemen, but he would say that since the session opened that hon. gentleman had been continually in his place. (Hear, hear.)¹²⁶ The hon. member for Argenteuil ... had no right to advert as he had to the former hon. gentleman, when he (Mr. Bellingham) had been¹²⁷ turned out of the House twice during the session for having got into the House by unfair means¹²⁸, (hear, hear,) while his hon. friend [Mr. Darche] had been duly elected by his constituents, and had faithfully discharged his duties throughout the whole session.¹²⁹ At the same time he was sure that if he [Mr. Darche] were there he would have no objection to withdraw his motion.¹³⁰

MR. BELLINGHAM felt himself bound to defend his own character from attacks made upon him, both by the Press and by hon. gentlemen in the House, and in doing so he considered that he was defending the characters of all the members in the House.¹³¹ [He] proceeded to justify his vote on the Want of Confidence motion. He had plainly asserted upon that occasion "that he would not support

the Government if they gave any further aid to the Grand Trunk Road *under its present management*." (Hear, hear.) He had been repeatedly attacked by the hon. member for Lambton and the press, with being bribed and sold to the Administration, but he indignantly repudiated any such position, and was quite prepared to defend his honour before the country. (Hear, hear.)¹³²

MR. DUFRESNE supported the motion of the hon. member for Kent, which he held not to insult the house. (Oh! oh!) It was not doing that hon. member justice to mix up his motion with the other. The hon. member for Chambly should have asked for the appointment of a committee to find out if any corruption had really been exercised.¹³³ If the motion of the hon. member for Chambly was slightly altered, it would be very applicable in some places.¹³⁴

MR. PAPIN rallied the ministry on the opportunity which this instance afforded them to present an exception to their uniform weakness, by enlisting a larger majority than upon a vote of confidence, when they had only "four." It had been so patent to every body, within and without the house, that the present administration maintained itself by the most questionable means — caballing and intrigue — the public and the legislature alike should be obliged to the hon. member for Chambly for having thus rebuked such flagrant venality. (Hear, hear.) The constant violations of the privileges of parliament involved in these corruptions practised by the government, were far more offensive to the house than it was possible for any notice of the kind under discussion to effect. He believed the hon. member for Maskinonge had taken the present step against the author of this notice from a mere motive of revenge, and had statedly pressed it in the absence of that hon. gentleman with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage of him.¹³⁵

MR. TURCOTTE (amidst loud cries of "question") challenged the members of the Opposition to show a solitary instance of the purchase they so vociferously inveighed against.¹³⁶

MR. PAPIN would do so immediately, if the hon. member would allow him the floor for an instant.¹³⁷

MR. TURCOTTE. — Wait. He regretted that the notice of the hon. member for Chambly did not involve a distinct accusation, that he might have been held to proof.¹³⁸

MR. PAPIN rose to speak, but the floor was kept by the hon. Mr. Cayley.¹³⁹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY stated in reference to the hon. member for Shefford, that he never asked him what vote he would give or what course he would take in reference to the late vote of want of confidence or any other matter. The hon. gentleman had always acted with him and voted with him — except in the case of the Maine Liquor Law question.¹⁴⁰ Since his [Mr. Cayley's] name had been alluded to in the debate, in reference to the vote of the member for Argenteuil, he would state what took place. The member for Argenteuil (Mr. Bellingham) declared that he would vote against any administration that would give aid to the Grand Trunk railway, under its present management. When that member left the house, he (Mr. Cayley) spoke to him on the subject; and there was more than one pair of eyes watching them, and very possibly more than one pair of ears listening to them. He (Mr. Cayley) told him that, as was well known, he was an advocate for giving that road aid, by every legitimate means; but that he could not approve of the course taken by the Board, and that he was no friend of the present system, and that he had expressed his opinion that the present system of paying the members of the Board for their attendance was a very bad system, and he did not ask aid with a view to continuing the present system. He then neither asked what impression his explanation had made on the hon. member, nor how he intended to vote. (Hear, hear.) That was all the explanation he had to make. (Applause.)¹⁴¹

Mr. Sanborn's amendment was then put¹⁴².

(570)

Mr. *Sanborn* moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. *James Smith*, That the words "the said Notice being a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an insult to its Members" be left out, and the words "and also the first Notice of Mr. *Larwill*, made on the 2nd May last, viz: — 'An Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, a Return of the number of all Negro or Colored Male or Female, Quadroon, Mulatto, Samboes, Half-breeds or Mules, Mongrels or Conglomerates, in the Penitentiary, Lunatic Asylum, or other Public Institutions, as also the proportion of those curious classes or varieties of the Provincial Population as compared with the *Celt* and *Saxon* Races,' — as a gross insult to the dignity of this House" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Delong, Antoine A. Dorion, Drummond, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Rolph, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, and Wright*. — (27.)

(570-571)

NAYS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Biggar, Bowes, Burton, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Dostaler, Dufresne, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Guévremont, Labelle, Laberge, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Merritt, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Prévost, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding*. — (61.)

(571)

So it passed in the Negative.

And the Question being again proposed, That the Notice placed on the List of Notices of Motions, on the 3rd of June instant, by Mr. *Darche*, Member for the County of *Chambly*, be expunged from the List, the said Notice being a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an insult to its Members;

On motion of Mr. *Loranger*, seconded by Mr. *Desaulniers*, amendments were made to the Question by leaving out the words "a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and" and the words "its Members" and inserting after the word "to" the words "the Members of this House;"

MR. J. DORION moved in amendment to the effect that the notice of motion of the hon. member for Kent be expunged from the notice-paper.¹⁴³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the House had just decided that the notice of the hon. member for the County of Kent shall not be expunged.¹⁴⁴

The main motion was then put¹⁴⁵.

(571)

Then the Question so amended, being put, That the Notice placed on the List of Notices of Motions, on the 3rd of June instant, by Mr. *Darche*, Member for the County of *Chambly*, be expunged from the List, the said Notice being an insult to the Members of this House; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs *Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Biggar, Bowes, Burton, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Drummond, Dufresne, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Guévremont, Labelle, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Mongenais, O'Farrell*,

Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Robinson, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Yeilding. — (57.)

NAYS.

Messieurs Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Delong, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Merritt, Angus Morrison, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Prévost, Rolph, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Valois, and Wright. — (31.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.¹⁴⁶

On motion of Mr. *Stevenson*, seconded by Mr. *Bell*,
Resolved, That this House doth concur in the Nineteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Printing.

The house then agreed to go through the order[s] of the day, advancing a stage any bills not opposed by one or more members.¹⁴⁷

(572) | The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to provide for the execution of the Office of Speaker of the Legislative Assembly in certain cases, being read;

On motion of MR. MACKENZIE¹⁴⁸,

(572) | The Bill was accordingly read a second time.
Ordered, That the Bill be now read the third time, and the Rules of this House suspended as regards the same.
 The Bill was accordingly read the third time.
Resolved, That the Bill do pass.
Ordered, That Mr. *Mackenzie* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

The House resumed the further consideration of the Amendment which was, on Wednesday last, proposed to be made to the Question, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (for the House in Committee of Supply); and which Amendment was, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "the said Order of the day (for the House in Committee of Supply) be postponed until Friday next" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment: — It passed in the Negative.

MR. DRUMMOND ... [moved] the second item [on the Orders of the day] — "Receiving Report of Committee of the Whole on Bill for Incorporation of Religious and other Societies¹⁴⁹".

[The motion] was opposed.¹⁵⁰

(572) | The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the Society called the Union of *St. Joseph* of *Montreal*, being read;

MR. A. DORION moved the second reading of the Bill, with the understanding that it would be dropped, if Mr. Drummond's bill passed.¹⁵¹

MR. DRUMMOND. — I should like to know if there is any doubt about the other bill passing. (Hear, hear.)¹⁵²

Mr. Dorion's bill was then read a second time¹⁵³.

(572) | The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

MR. DRUMMOND. — I wish to proceed with the second item. Is it opposed?¹⁵⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — It is a Government measure.¹⁵⁵

MR. DUFRESNE. — It is opposed.¹⁵⁶

(572)

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to amend the Municipal Act of *Lower Canada*, being read;

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill in relation to Foreign Insurance Companies and Insurance Agents, being read;

On motion of MR. GAMBLE, in absence of hon. Mr. Cameron,¹⁵⁷

(572)

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to a Select Committee, composed of Mr. *Gamble*, Mr. *Crawford*, Mr. *Brown*, Mr. *Holton*, Mr. *Hartman*, Mr. *Loranger*, and Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to amend the *Lower Canada* Municipal and Road Act of 1855, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to a Select Committee, composed of Mr. *Chapais*, the Honorable Mr. *Drummond*, Mr. *Taché*, Mr. *Poulin*, and Mr. *Thibaudeau*, to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to exempt the Tools or Instruments of any Debtor's trade or calling, and the wearing apparel, the bedding, and other furniture necessary for the use of his family, from seizure and sale under execution for debt, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to a Select Committee, composed of Mr. *Mackenzie*, the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, Mr. *Holton*, Mr. *Papin*, Mr. *Alley*, Mr. *Bowes*, and the Honorable Mr. *Chabot*, to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

(573)

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill for establishing a general system of Police in the Province, and an efficient Police Force in certain Cities and Towns, and in other places where the Municipal authorities shall require it, being read;

On motion of MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD,¹⁵⁸

(573)

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to amend the *Lower Canada* Municipal and Road Act of 1855, being read;

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to secure to Married Women certain separate rights and property," being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to a Select Committee, composed of the Honorable Mr. *Merritt*, the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, the Honorable Mr. *Drummond*, Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*, the Honorable *John Sandfield Macdonald*, and Mr. *Freeman*, to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to extend the provisions of the Insolvent Debtors' Act, and for the relief of a certain class of persons therein mentioned, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and ordered to be read the third time To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill to encourage Shipbuilding within this Province; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Casault* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed him to report the same, without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be now read the third time, and the Rules of this House suspended as regards the same.

The Bill was accordingly read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass.

Ordered, That Mr. *Alleyn* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill to authorize the improvement of Water-courses; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Bureau* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed him to report the same, without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill to amend the Act establishing Mutual Fire Insurance Companies in *Lower Canada*; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Wright* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed him to report the same, without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to provide for the care of habitual Drunkards, and the custody and disposal of their effects, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to a Select Committee, composed of Mr. *Gamble*, Mr. *Hartman*, Mr. *Antoine Aimé Dorion*, Mr. *Polette*, and Mr. *Freeman*, to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to extend the provisions of the Act to facilitate Actions against persons associated for Commercial purposes, and against Incorporated Companies," being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and ordered to be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to incorporate certain persons under the style and title of the *Fort Erie Canal Company*, being read;

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to authorize the City of *London* to negotiate a Loan of One hundred thousand pounds, and to consolidate the Debt of the said City, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act incorporating Library Associations and Mechanics' Institutes, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and ordered to be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to alter and amend the Game Laws of *Upper Canada*, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and committed to a Committee of the whole House, for To-morrow.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to enable the Town Council of the Town of *St. Catharines* to sell and convey certain land purchased by the said Council for the purpose of a Public Cemetery, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to amend the Act 18 *Vic.* cap. 99, being read;

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to secure the freedom of Election at the next Election for the County of *Argenteuil*, being read;

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

Ordered, That the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to separate the County of *Peel* from the County of *York*, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill for the suppression of Lotteries;

MR. HOLTON called the attention of the Attorney General West to the fact, that several lotteries now in existence, and not infringing on any existing statutes, would be rendered penal if the law came at once into force. He alluded more especially to Bates' land lottery.¹⁵⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied that it would be impossible in such a case to make exceptions. However, the law will not come into force before July.¹⁶⁰

MR. FREEMAN suggested that it would be better to postpone the operation of the Bill until January next.¹⁶¹

The suggestion was adopted, and the Bill then passed through committee.¹⁶²

(575) and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Mackenzie* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made amendments thereunto.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. *Mackenzie* reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendments were read, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the North-Western Steamboat Company, being read;

[On motion of] MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD¹⁶³,

(575) The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill to incorporate the Town of *Sarnia*; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and

Mr. *Hartman* reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made amendments thereunto.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Mr. *Hartman* reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendments were read, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the day for the House in Committee to consider of a Resolution for an Address to Her Majesty, to grant to Messieurs *William Smith O'Brien* and *John Frost* Her Majesty's Most Gracious Amnesty and Forgiveness for past political offences in *Ireland* and *Wales*, being read;

Ordered, That the said Order be discharged.

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, pursuant to an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, — Return to an Address of the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated 5th May, 1856, for a Return shewing the rate of discount charged on *Upper Canada* Bank Notes paid for Tolls to the Collectors of Tolls at *Montreal*; the total amount of such discount for the years 1853, 1854, and 1855, respectively; and whether the same has been applied and accounted for as Tolls, or in what manner disposed of.

By Command.

E.A. Meredith,

Assist. Secy.

Secretary's Office,
Toronto, 5th June, 1856.

No. 41. — (Copy.)

Inspector General's Office,

Customs Department, *Toronto*, June 3rd, 1856.

Sir, — Having, in compliance with the Address of the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of the 5th May last, caused enquiry to be made into the rate of discount charged on *Upper Canada* Bank Notes paid for Tolls to the Collector of Tolls at *Montreal*, the total amount of such discounts for the years 1853, 1854, and 1855, respectively, and whether the same has been applied and accounted for as Tolls, or in what manner disposed of; I have now the honor to inclose to you a copy of the Report on that subject received from the Collector of Canal Tolls at *Montreal*, which contains all the information which it is in the power of the Department to give in relation to the subject matter of enquiry.

I beg leave also to enclose copy of the Letter addressed to the Collector of Tolls by the Manager of the Bank of *Upper Canada* at *Montreal*, in reference to the discounts in question.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

R.S.M. Bouchette.

The Honorable

The Provincial Secretary,
&c., &c., &c.

Canal Office, *Montreal*, 13th May, 1856.

Sir, — I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter of the 9th instant, with copy of an Address of the Honorable the Legislative Assembly, calling for a Return of discount charged on *Upper Canada* Notes, the amount of such discount for the years 1853, 1854, 1855, and how the same has been applied.

In reply, I beg respectfully to represent that the rate of discount charged at this Office is one half per cent., as authorized by a Letter from the *Upper Canada* Bank, addressed at the same time to the Collector of Customs at this Port, and myself, on our requesting to have the decision of the Bank in writing, a copy of which Letter I beg to annex herewith.

In respect to the amount of discount taken, I beg to observe, that no account whatever has been kept, but I can state that the numbers deposited this season average a little less than three pence a day.

In regard to the application of such discount, I have to remark that the Bank, after demanding, waived its claim to the same in favour of the Collecting Clerk, to meet incidental deficiencies, they being unavoidable where large sums are received in small amounts.

Respectfully submitting the foregoing as comprising the information in my power to give.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Alfred Gough,
Collector.

R.S.M. Bouchette, Esquire,
Commissioner of Customs.

(True Copy.) *R.S.M. Bouchette.*

Office, Bank of *Upper Canada*,
Montreal, 19th August, 1852.

Sir, — I beg to intimate to you, that I have this day received authority from the Head Office of this Institution, to charge one-half per cent. discount on all *Canada West* Notes presented by you in Deposit on account of the Honorable Receiver General. This decision having been come to in conformity with your request.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

Alfred Gough, Esquire,
Collector of *St. Lawrence* Canal Tolls.

Edward T. Taylor, Accountant,
pro Manager.

(True Copy.) *R.S.M. Bouchette.*

Then, on motion of Mr. *Brown*, seconded by Mr. *Mackenzie*,
The House adjourned.¹⁶⁴

Appendix

[DISCUSSION RE: BILL FOR PROTECTION OF SQUATTERS IN THE TOWNSHIPS OF LOWER CANADA.]

MR. J. DORION moved the house into Committee on the Bill for Protection of Squatters in the townships of Lower Canada.¹⁶⁵

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — Did this Bill come under the scrutiny of the member for Shefford, when Attorney General?¹⁶⁶

MR. DRUMMOND. — I leave it in the hands of the Government. I have my own views on these subjects. (Laughter.)¹⁶⁷

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER. — Then I oppose the Bill.¹⁶⁸

[DISCUSSION RE: BILL TO INCORPORATE THE QUEBEC PROTESTANT MALE ORPHAN ASYLUM.]

MR. CHABOT, in absence of Mr. Rhodes, moved the second reading of the bill to incorporate the Quebec Male Orphan Asylum.¹⁶⁹

MR. DRUMMOND. — The policy adopted by the Government hitherto was to oppose the second reading of those bills, as their objects will all be comprehended under the general measure. I do not see why the Government should have altered this policy — (hear, hear,) — unless it is the determination of some of the members of the Government to oppose the general measure. (Hear, hear.) I should have liked to have seen the Government maintaining the firm attitude in this matter, which they took formerly. But I shall insist on the carrying of the general measure this session, unless we are surprised by a dissolution. (Hear, hear.) I oppose the second reading of this bill.¹⁷⁰

Footnotes

1. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
2. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
3. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
9. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
10. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
11. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
12. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
13. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
18. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
19. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
20. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
25. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
29. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
30. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
35. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
36. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
37. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*

41. *Globe*, 6 June 1856. Mr. Larwill's notices were put on the notice list on 2 May 1856 (see Volume XIII, Part IV, pages 1772-1773).
42. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
43. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
50. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
51. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
52. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
53. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
57. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
58. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
59. Telegraph (*Montreal Transcript*, 7 June 1856).
60. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
61. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
62. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
63. Telegraph (*Montreal Gazette*, 6 June 1856).
64. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
66. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
67. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
68. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
69. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
70. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
71. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
72. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Ibid.*
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Ibid.*
79. *Ibid.*
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Ibid.*
82. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856, differs from the *Journals* in its account of this division, reporting the names of Messrs. Mattice and Young, instead of Messrs. Meagher and Yeilding.
83. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
84. Telegraph (*Montreal Transcript*, 7 June 1856).
85. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
86. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
87. Telegraph (*Pilot*, 6 June 1856).
88. Telegraph (*Montreal Gazette*, 6 June 1856).
89. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
91. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
92. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
93. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.

95. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
96. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
97. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
98. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
99. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
100. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
101. *Ibid.*
102. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
103. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
104. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
105. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
106. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
107. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
108. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
109. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
110. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
111. *Ibid.*
112. *Ibid.*
113. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
114. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
115. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
116. *Ibid.*
117. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
118. *Ibid.*
119. *Ibid.*
120. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
121. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
122. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
123. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
124. *Globe*, 6 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856, reports that Mr. Sanborn said "he simply considered the motion by the hon. member for Chambly an insult." This information appears erroneous in view of Mr. Sanborn's previous statements.
125. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
126. *Ibid.*
127. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
128. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
129. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
130. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
131. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856. *Globe*, 6 June 1856, reports that Mr. Bellingham replied "in a very warm manner".
132. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
133. *Ibid.*
134. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
135. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
136. *Ibid.*
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Ibid.*
139. *Ibid.*
140. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
141. *Globe*, 6 June 1856. This newspaper also reports a commentary regarding Messrs. Cayley and Bellingham's conversation on the subject of the Grand Trunk.
142. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
143. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
144. *Ibid.*
145. *Ibid.*
146. In a commentary, *Globe*, 6 June 1856, reports that this debate on Mr. Darche's notice of motion went on for "more than four hours". Additional commentaries are found in *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856, and *Le Pays*, 7 and 10 June 1856.

147. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
148. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
149. *Globe*, 6 June 1856. This motion, as well as Mr. Drummond's second attempt to proceed with the said item, are inserted within the proceedings according to the sequence of motions reported in the *Globe*.
150. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
151. *Ibid.*
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Globe*, 6 June 1856. *Montreal Gazette*, 5 April 1856, provides a short commentary on this Bill.
154. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Ibid.*
157. *Ibid.*
158. *Ibid.*
159. *Ibid.*
160. *Ibid.*
161. *Ibid.*
162. *Ibid.*
163. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856.
164. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 6 June 1856, reports that the House adjourned "at half past eleven o'clock."
165. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.
166. *Ibid.*
167. *Ibid.*
168. *Ibid.*
169. *Globe*, 6 June 1856. According to this paper, this matter was brought up after the second reading of the Bill to incorporate L'Union St. Joseph de Montréal.
170. *Globe*, 6 June 1856.

FRIDAY, 6 JUNE 1856¹

(577)

ON motion of Mr. Solicitor General *Smith*, seconded by the Honorable Mr. *Spence*,
Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

On motion of MR. FREEMAN,²

(577)

A Bill to extend the provisions of the Insolvent Debtors' Act, and for the relief of a certain class of persons therein mentioned, was, according to Order, read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to extend the provisions of the Insolvent Debtors' Act of *Upper Canada*, and for the relief of a certain class of persons therein mentioned."

Ordered, That Mr. *Freeman* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

The Order of the day for the third reading of the Bill to authorize the improvement of Water-courses, being read;

MR. PRÉVOST moved that ... [the Bill] be read a third time and passed.³

MR. TURCOTTE called the attention of the House to the extraordinary and extravagant powers conferred by the bill on Municipal Councils. It was well known that the people of Lower Canada had struggled long but successfully against the right usurped by the Seigniors over the water powers and manufactures. Yet this bill now proposed to hand over all these powers into the hands of the Municipal Councils.⁴ [It] would also have the effect of retarding individual enterprise by undue restrictions.⁵ By this bill the County Superintendent was empowered to decide on the erection of the works. The height of the dam, width of the canals, the mills, manufactures, and so forth. This would be a most objectionable proceeding, and he would therefore move that the bill be not now read a third time, but be read a third time this day six months.⁶

MR. DRUMMOND took the same view, and contended that all power of regulating damages to property by the formation of water power should be left in the hands of the Courts of Law, and not be given to the municipalities as was proposed by this Bill.⁷ If it passed, it would create very great abuses, retard the prosperity of Lower Canada, and defeat the object the hon. member for Terrebonne had in view. He therefore hoped the honorable gentleman would not press the third reading.⁸

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS concurred in the opinion that the extraordinary powers conferred by this bill were exceedingly dangerous.⁹

After a short discussion Mr. Turcot[t]e's motion was withdrawn¹⁰.

The Order of the Day was discharged and the Bill ordered to be recommitted on Monday next.¹¹

(577)

On motion of Mr. *Prévost*, seconded by Mr. *Bourassa*,
Ordered, That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, for Monday next, and be then the first Order of the day.

[On motion of] MR. SANBORN¹²,

- (577) | A Bill to amend the Act establishing Mutual Fire Insurance Companies in *Lower Canada*, was, according to Order, read the third time.
 | *Resolved*, That the Bill do pass.
 | *Ordered*, That Mr. *Sanborn* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. CASAULT¹³,

- (577) | A Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled, "An Act to extend the provisions of the Act to facilitate Actions against persons associated for Commercial purposes, and against unincorporated Companies," was, according to Order, read the third time.
 | *Resolved*, That the Bill do pass.
 | *Ordered*, That Mr. *Casault* do carry back the Bill to the Legislative Council, and acquaint their Honors, that this House hath passed the same, without any Amendment.

[On motion of] MR. BELL¹⁴,

- (577) | A Bill to amend the Act incorporating Library Associations and Mechanics' Institutes, was, according to Order, read the third time.
 | *Resolved*, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act for incorporating Library Associations and Mechanics' Institutes."
 | *Ordered*, That Mr. *Bell* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. PAPIN, in absence of Hon. Mr. Cameron¹⁵,

- (577) | A Bill for the suppression of Lotteries, was, according to Order, read the third time.
 | *Resolved*, That the Bill do pass.
 | *Ordered*, That Mr. *Gamble* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

[On motion of] MR. BROWN¹⁶,

- (577) | A Bill to incorporate the Town of *Sarnia*, was, according to Order, read the third time.
 | *Resolved*, That the Bill do pass, and the Title be, "An Act to incorporate the Town of *Sarnia*, in the County of *Lambton*."
 | *Ordered*, That Mr. *Brown* do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY then moved the House into committee of Supply, and also that the Message of his Excellency the Governor General recommending the appropriation of £25,000 for the opening up of waste lands, be referred to the same committee; and further, that the supplementary estimate of the Board of Works for the repairs of Port Stanley and Burlington Bay Pier[s], be referred to the same committee.¹⁷

MR. DRUMMOND said that the next item on the orders of the day was the reception of the report of the committee on the bill for the incorporation of Religious and other Societies; and he would like to know why that order should be passed over.¹⁸ I would wish to have some understanding with the Government with reference to the measures which the prime minister requested me to carry through — as to the time when they will allow me to bring up those measures, and especially that which now stands first.

(Hear, hear.) If it is not their intention to allow me to go on with it this morning, I beg to know at what time I shall be allowed? I know the control of these Government measures is in their hands, and they may take up any measure they please, but in fairness to me they should not place me in the position of being exposed to the ridicule of the country in this matter. (Hear, hear.)¹⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The Government have been endeavouring to get at the Supplies for some days, and when these are passed we shall be able so [sic] say what business can be taken up before the close of the session. If the hon. gentleman allows it to stand over till the afternoon, I will in the meantime consult with my colleagues and let him know our intentions.²⁰

MR. DRUMMOND said that if the Government would state that they only intended passing a few items of the supply, there might, perhaps, be no objection to their doing so.²¹

No, no, from the Ministerial side of the house.²²

MR. HOLTON. — I think it due to the member for Shefford, and due to the house and to the country, that the Government should give some explicit statement of their intentions in regard to that measure. (Hear, hear.) It is within my knowledge that the organs of some members of the administration are seeking to throw all the responsibility and odium — for a certain degree of odium has been made to attach to the measure — on that hon. gentleman, and to free his late colleagues of the whole of it — notwithstanding that it was stated explicitly²³ in the house that all the ministry were in favor of, and responsible for that measure, and would assist the hon. member for Shefford in carrying it through. (Hear, hear.) It was therefore due to that hon. gentleman ... that they should explicitly state whether they meant to disown all connection with that bill.²⁴ The hon. gentleman has been most unfairly and ungenerously attacked by the friends and organs of several of his late colleagues, although up to the present time there can be no doubt that they are quite as responsi[ble] as he is.²⁵ (Hear, hear.)²⁶ Now, when they find it likely to be unpopular with a portion of their supporters, they seem desirous of throwing the matter over. I do think they are pursuing a course which reflects very little credit are [sic] themselves.²⁷ He [Mr. Holton] would like to know what the Government intended to do.²⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — If we take any course that is discreditable, to us the discredit will attach. If we are at all capable of being where we are, we are capable of conducting the affairs of the Government in such order as may commend itself to us. The Government has been endeavouring to press the Supplies through for a considerable period, and when that is done, we, of course, intend to go on with the Government measures which are upon the paper.²⁹ (Cries of no, no.)³⁰

MR. BROWN. — I would suggest to the ex-Attorney General that he should endeavour to press his Bill through before the Supplies. If he does not, I am afraid it will have little chance of being passed this session. (Hear, hear.)³¹

MR. MACKENZIE then made some remarks on the Estimates³².

The motion of the Inspector General for referring the Governor's Message, &c., to the Committee of Supply, was agreed to.³³

(578)

The Order of the day being read, for the House in Committee of Supply;
Ordered, That the Message of His Excellency the Governor General, of the 29th May last, recommending a grant of Twenty five thousand pounds in aid of Colonization; and a further Supplementary Estimate for repairs at *Port Stanley*, Ten thousand pounds, and for *Burlington Bay Piers*, Five hundred pounds, be referred to the said Committee.

The Honorable Mr. *Cayley* moved, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Macdonald*, and the Question being proposed, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;

MR. MACKENZIE moved in amendment, "That the Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that it be resolved, that it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State, (laughter) and that this house cannot give its sanction to the following items of expenditure recorded on page 289 of the Public Accounts, as having been paid to Clarke Gamble, for the purchase of pew number 45, Western Gallery, St. James' Cathedral, Toronto, £50 [sic]; and to Isabella Horn[e], for pew 40, Western Gallery, same Cathedral, £125." He asked why no returns had been made in conformity with an address voted by the House calling for a particular account of the expenditure of £90,000 in effecting improvement of certain public buildings and other institutions. In various particulars these statements of public expenditure showed the greatest extravagance. — He had always advocated economy in the public service, an extravagance such as these accounts reveal is destructive of good government. The purchase of Pews in the Cathedral, one for the Governor General, and one for the Councils and Assembly, is an instance of that extravagance, of the disregard by government of the law they have sworn to maintain, and of their utter disregard [sic] of their own protestations that they separated and would keep separate Church and State. Why didn't they buy a couple of Pews in the Presbyterian church, or in the Roman Catholic Cathedral? They might have bought a dozen Pews in the Roman Catholic Cathedral for the same money, and if they had, what a Protestant roar there would have been from one end of the province to the other, they are trying to convert us and hand us over to the Pope! It was a gross instance of their appropriation of money without the sanction of the law.³⁴ A singular [sic] course of procedure on the part of the then Government, caused the rebellion of 1837.³⁵ He saw men before him who had urged their brethren to rebel, and sent up to us to help them to do it, because the government of 1837 had taken money out of the public treasury in defiance of law.³⁶ The present Attorney General East was one of those parties who had made himself so obnoxious by encouraging that rebellion, that he was outlawed and a price set on his head. Yet that same gentleman now sits there as Her Majesty's principal law adviser, and advocates the very course which lit the flame of civil war in 1837, and for denouncing which that hon. gentleman then barely escaped being hanged, drawn and quartered, like many others. (Hear, hear.)³⁷ These men now hold the highest offices, they take £102,000 out of the public chest in six months in spite of the law; they do what they please with it; corrupt whom they please; bid defiance to the constitution, and a stranger at their head as governor, orders all this to be done; orders our money to be paid without asking our consent, for his private pew in church, and for other pews in Dr. Strachan's cathedral. Is this separating church and state? Did not John Hampden get a glorious name in England merely for resisting the illegal demand of 20 shillings?³⁸ Were hon. gentlemen in that House only sent there to carry out the wishes of the Government, whether they were right or wrong? Were they to be as ductile as wax to receive any impression the Government wished? He for one, was not sent to that House for any such object, and he never would consent to it. What was wrong — a grievous public wrong — in 1836, was still the game [sic]. The hon. gentleman then entered into an eloquent denunciation of the government policy respecting the County of Haldimand, the port of which county was the eighth exporting port in the Province; and concluded by moving ... [his] amendment³⁹.

[The motion was] seconded by MR. AIKINS.⁴⁰

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD explained that it was always the practice to provide His Excellency with a seat in the church to which he belonged. And were His Excellency a Presbyterian, a Methodist, or a Roman Catholic, they would provide him a seat in the place of worship belonging to his denomination.⁴¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said, that this was the first time that the Government had been called upon to supply a pew for the Governor General. He never [sic] heard of it before, and it appeared to him to be very untimely to begin now with all those extravagant requirements which are connected with the salary of the Governor himself. (Hear, hear.) Because that the Government in England provided a

Box at the theatre for a high dignitary, was that any reason why one should be kept up in one particular church in Canada for His Excellency the Governor General?⁴²

MR. SCATCHERD thought the cases were similar.⁴³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD thought that His Excellency ought to pay for his pew out of his own pocket. He was not afraid to say that.⁴⁴

MR. SCATCHERD strongly objected to voting this appropriation for His Excellency. Surely it was not too much to ask that His Excellency pay for his pew in church. He considered it a great insult to bring down such an account.⁴⁵

SIR A. MACNAB thought it a very inconvenient practice to discuss items of public expenditure before the house went into Committee. He did not see that the making this grant would establish any precedent. The hon. member for Glengary knew as well as he, that ever since they had had a Parliament, and a Governor General, His Excellency had always provided a pew for himself in the Church at public cost.⁴⁶

MR. MACKENZIE. — There was no pew for him in Quebec.⁴⁷

SIR A. MACNAB. — Yes, there was. Had the hon. member for Haldimand been in the habit of going to the church there, he would have seen His Excellency's pew, surmounted by the royal arms.⁴⁸ The same practice was carried out in Montreal ... for many years,⁴⁹ [and] in Toronto, the Governor General was, for the last 30 or 40 years, provided with a pew for his accommodation and these distinguished strangers whom he might wish to introduce.⁵⁰ He thought it was a very small affair for the house to proceed with the present matter. He saw nothing wrong in the course taken by the government.⁵¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said, he would not be prepared to adopt as a precedent a discussion before the house upon any items in the Estimates; but the question was not submitted to the house in that view, it was one asking the house to censure the Government with having expended an amount of money without the consent of the house.⁵²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD would like to know when such a charge for a pew for His Excellency was ever submitted to this house before?⁵³

SIR A. MACNAB said, there had been.⁵⁴

MR. J.S. MACDONALD never had seen it. In what year or what part of the Public Accounts did it appear?⁵⁵

SIR A. MACNAB could not say.⁵⁶

MR. HOLTON agreed with the hon. and gallant knight that the items of supply ought not to be discussed except in committee of the whole — more especially so, when, as in the present case, the item was so small.⁵⁷ There might be some propriety in moving to strike the item out when the Report of the Committee came up.⁵⁸ Unless there were a wish on the part of the House to stop the supplies, he could not see any object in putting the motion now before the House. And, without feeling himself committed to the principle of providing church accommodation for the Head of the Government, he should vote against the motion.⁵⁹

MR. FELTON explained that in Montreal a pew had been bought for the use of the Governor General, and that one also had been bought in the old Cathedral here, which was burned down. He maintained, therefore, that a pew should be bought for His Excellency in the present Cathedral.⁶⁰

MR. FERRES wished to inform the hon. member for Glengary, that the Protestant Church at Quebec was built out of monies from the Military Chest in the first place, and was afterwards transferred by the Brit[i]sh Government to the Protestant Church. He thought that a pew should be provided. (Question.)⁶¹

MR. MACKENZIE rose to explain, but was cried down.⁶²

The House then divided on Mr. Mackenzie's motion⁶³.

(578)

Mr. Mackenzie moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. Aikins, That all the words after "That" to the end of the Question be left out, and the words "it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State, and that this House will not give its sanction to the following Items of Expenditure, recorded in page 289 of the Public Accounts, as having been paid to C. Gamble for the purchase of Pew, No. 45, Western Gallery, St. James' Cathedral, Toronto, One hundred and fifty-five pounds; and to pay Isabella L. Horne for Pew, No. 40, Western Gallery, (same Cathedral,) One hundred and twenty-five pounds" inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow: —

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Bell, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Christie, Cook, Charles Daoust, Darche, Delong, Jean B.E. Dorion, Foley, Frazer, Gould, Hartman, Jobin, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Scatcherd, and Wright. — (23.)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bureau, Attorney General Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Clarke, Crawford, Desaulniers, Dionne, Antoine A. Dorion, Dostaler, Dufresne, Evanturel, Fellowes, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Guévremont, Holton, Labelle, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Meagher, Merritt, Mongenais, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Prévost, Rhodes, Solicitor General Ross, James Ross, Sanborn, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Supple, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Valois, Wilson, and Yeilding. — (59.)

So it passed in the Negative.⁶⁴

SIR A. MACNAB rose to make a few enquiries respecting the member for North Ontario (Mr. Gould). He had been informed that that gentleman was a contractor with the Government for carrying part of the mails. If so, the Postmaster General should say so at once, as he ought to be aware that if such was the case the member for North Ontario incurred a penalty of £500 a day, every day he remained in the House, after entering into the contract.⁶⁵

MR. MACKENZIE. — Oh dear!⁶⁶

SIR A. MACNAB said, it was one of those matters which ought to be noticed. That hon. gentleman was mostly anxious to control the action of the Government, but his present position was very objectionable. It was the duty of the Government to have brought this matter forward.⁶⁷

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD rose to make some observations⁶⁸ —

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER submitted whether this was the proper way to bring such a matter forward. It should be brought forward as a question of privilege and not upon this motion, because if the house went beyond this motion they might allow any hon. member of the house to submit any question he pleased.⁶⁹ Was the matter going to be brought before the House?⁷⁰

SIR A. MACNAB replied that it was.⁷¹

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER then stated that of course hon. gentlemen could express their views on it.⁷²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD stated that he had a conversation with the member for North Ontario, and that he told him the error of his position, and at the same time advised him to consult with his legal advisers on his position without delay.⁷³ He believed that the hon. gentleman now adverted to (Mr. Gould) had acted unwittingly.⁷⁴

MR. JOBIN wished to know if it was true that Mr. Vankoughnet, the President of the Council, had already received one quarter of his salary? (Laughter, order, order.)⁷⁵

MR. BROWN thought that the privileges of the house ought to be protected, and no hon. member should sit there contrary to the rules of Parliament; but there was a peculiarity in this case, and he did not think the hon. member for Ontario was to be condemned. Members had frequently sat in that house in a similar position to that occupied by the hon. member for Ontario. The hon. member for Oxford sat in it while Postmaster, and several other gentleman [sic]. Mr. Gould never received a sixpence of the emolument.⁷⁶

MR. GOULD explained his position. He had nothing to do with such a contract in the way of having received a sixpence for it. It was quite a misimpression. — He had consented to allow the contract to be made in his name, for the purpose of having the mail service completed⁷⁷ across his part of the country. Indeed he was forced to take it up himself, as no one else would do so,⁷⁸ and had accepted the sum of £50 as an equivalent for doing so; but it was transferred to another person, to whom he was compelled to loan his property for the purpose of enabling him to complete it — as £50, instead of being any remuneration for the service, was only one-fourth of what it actually cost. £200 would be nearer the mark.⁷⁹ He had consulted with his legal adviser, as Mr. Macdonald had recommended, and he begged to thank that gentleman for his kindness, and his legal adviser told him to take no notice of the matter⁸⁰, as there are other members in the house in a much worse position⁸¹. The contract had been transferred out of his hands a year ago, and the only matter was that the contract had not been removed out of his office.⁸² But he had omitted to state, this morning, to the Attorney General, the reasons why he had not followed out the course recommended.⁸³

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that discussions of the kind might, if permitted to go on, do a great wrong to any member implicated, when there was no substantive motion before the Chair, and would, besides, establish a dangerous precedent.⁸⁴

Some ineffectual efforts were made to prolong the discussion; but the house sustained the ruling of the Chair, and the subject dropped.⁸⁵

MR. MACKENZIE ... [moved in amendment to] the motion to go into Committee of Supply⁸⁶, that the Speaker do not leave the chair, but that the House consider the following motion: That the best interests of Upper and Lower Canada would be promoted by a repeal of the Union.⁸⁷

After a short discussion as to the amendment being in order,⁸⁸

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ruled it out of order, and said that it would be better, notwithstanding any precedents in this country to the contrary, to adopt the rule of the English House of Commons, which prohibits a second amendment to the motion to go into supply from being moved.⁸⁹

The House then went into committee of the whole on the supplies⁹⁰.

(578)

Then the main Question being put;
Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.
 The House accordingly resolved itself into the said Committee;

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY moved the adoption of an appropriation of £11,500 for the support of the Provincial Penitentiary at Kingston.⁹¹

MR. BROWN opposed the motion.⁹² The amount voted to the Penitentiary had increased so much since 1851, as to render the institution a burden to the country. The expense had been reduced by the Inspectors, in 1851, to just £5,000, and now it had been increased to more than double that amount. There must evidently be something wrong in the management. The institution ought to be self-sustaining, as the best managed institutions in the United States are.⁹³ He could see no use for this extra expenditure.⁹⁴

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD reminded the hon. member for Lambton that the Institution in question had not yet received a fair trial. It was the only building of the kind in Canada⁹⁵. The additional expense was caused by the necessity for erecting new buildings, in consequence of the natural increase of crime in a largely increasing population. The charge of mismanagement was scarcely well founded, considering the character of the present Warden, who was one of the most zealous and indefatigable public officers in the country, and who was, besides, acting under the supervision of two inspectors. Part of the expense had been caused by the occurrence of one or two fires, which caused the destruction of the workshops.⁹⁶

MR. BROWN said that the defence made by the Attorney General was not satisfactory. The Government could not relieve itself from responsibility by appealing to the supervision of the inspectors.⁹⁷ [He] thought that the Attorney General had enunciated a new view of responsible Government. He maintained the head officers of that institution were, as it was, well paid for what duty they performed.⁹⁸ The argument that new buildings must be constructed was not a good one, as there had been a good deal of extravagance in that respect. There were splendid workshops erected originally, and because it was thought that the windows were not sufficiently large, new workshops were erected⁹⁹. He advocated the introduction of such trades into the Penitentiary that men might labor at singly — as at present a great many trades were existing in that institution such as at the foundry — where many men labor in gangs. His object was to keep the prisoners unknown as much as possible — as if known, no men would work in the same establishment with them.¹⁰⁰ Besides, a large additional outlay for salaries to guards was caused by the introduction of new species of manufactures into the institution.¹⁰¹ It required one overseer to every ten men under the present system. If no change was made the House would be called on year after year to make grants for the support of the institution. He highly commended a former policy of the Government not to exceed an outlay of £6000 for this institution. The hon. member then referred to the increasing number of convicts — which had been urged as an argument for getting an increased grant — and stated that was an argument in his favor — as the greater the number of convicts the greater the revenue ought to be, and the institution ought to cost less — that is if the labor system was properly carried out.¹⁰²

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — The great loss arose from a contract given by the commissioners at too low a price. The whole amount of convict labour was less than the price of provisions during the last year. £2,300 had been spent in new buildings, and from these facts it was easy to see that the sum proposed was necessary to make up the whole amount required.¹⁰³

MR. BROWN asked what was the highest sum given per day under any present contract.¹⁰⁴

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — 2s 10d per day.¹⁰⁵

MR. BROWN contended that this was in reality no higher than the 1s 9d given under former contracts, as the trades for which that was given required less superintendence. The point that he wished to put was that it would have been more profitable to have employed the convicts as shoemakers and tailors at 1s 9d per day than as they were now employed at 2s 10d, as they could be managed with so many less keepers. The largest price given in any institution is 2s 11d per day, and that was given for a small gang of long experience. The average, at this moment, in Auburn is only 33 or 34 cents.¹⁰⁶

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH. — Each contractor furnishes his own engine and fuel.¹⁰⁷

MR. BROWN. — Granting all that, the salaries of the officers had been raised £3,400 per annum, including, of course, the Inspectors' salaries. He was quite sure that the matter required looking into, and that the trades should yield a much larger return. The first object was to reform the criminals, and the next to maintain good discipline, and neither could be done by the present system.¹⁰⁸

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that when everything was considered, and when they remembered that £6,000 was the limit fixed for the aid to be given by Government when everything was half the price it is now, the present estimate was not extravagant. Besides there was a large sum for new buildings. He went on to pay a high compliment to the present warden for his attention to the duties of his office.¹⁰⁹

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH also spoke in high terms of the present warden. He was, however, of the opinion that the intentions of the Bill had not been carried out with regard to the Inspectors. He thought the executive power should be in the hands of the warden.¹¹⁰

MR. BROWN agreed in this, but contended that the general results were unsatisfactory, and that but for some mismanagement the expense would not be so great.¹¹¹

The item was then agreed to¹¹².

The house adjourned¹¹³.

The house again met at four o'clock, and resolved itself into Committee of Supply.¹¹⁴

The next item taken up in the Estimates was — "To make good various indispensable expenses of the Civil Government, incurred during the year 1855, as detailed in Statement A of the Public Accounts, laid before the Legislature — £102,015 16s. 6d."¹¹⁵

MR. BROWN complained that the Government should have spent so large an amount as this without the authority of Parliament, only putting it in the Estimates after it was all spent. (Hear, hear.) One item was — "towards the sustenance of children born and reared in the Marine and Emigrant Hospital, Quebec, £100" — another — "to cover expenses in procuring the history, tradition, &c., of the Huron tribe of Indians, £50." What right had the Government to pay out those sums, without asking the authority of Parliament? The next item in Statement A of the Public Accounts was — "To Right Rev. P.F. Turgeon, amount payable to him under the award made by the Experts, of the value of the property of the Sisters of Charity, Quebec, consumed by fire while in possession of Government, £11,976 10s." How did the country come to be responsible for that large sum? Under what authority did the Government make that arbitration?¹¹⁶

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — The claim having been made, an arbitration was granted to find out its legality, and the Government had no other alternative than to pay the amount.¹¹⁷

MR. BROWN. — As I understand it, this building leased by the Government from an Ecclesiastical Corporation, was destroyed by an accidental fire. But how came it that the Government were responsible for the value of the building?¹¹⁸

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY. — Who is to be the judge of that? The member for Lambton, or the Crown officer?¹¹⁹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — There was a lease made of these premises to the government. The building was partly insured, and the proprietor had a claim against the government for the whole, or a portion of the value of the building. The Crown officers, on being consulted, gave advice that the government was to a certain extent liable, and it was thought better not to have a law suit, but a legal arbitration; and when I mention the names of the gentlemen chosen as arbitrators, I think it will be admitted that they were competent for the task. They were Messrs. Taschereau and Okill Stuart of Quebec, and Mr. Rose of Montreal. The gentlemen found that, by the law of Lower Canada, the government was liable; and then there was an arbitration to fix the value of the property.¹²⁰

MR. BROWN thought the government had acted most improperly in paying out that large sum of money on its own responsibility. All those arbitrations should have been submitted to Parliament, and its consent obtained. But he understood the building was insured to a large amount. Was it possible that it was worth £12,000 over the insurance?¹²¹

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD. — The value of the building was £25,000.¹²²

MR. BROWN. — Then buildings must be estimated at a very high rate in Quebec. (Hear, hear.) The next item of monies paid away by the government, without the authority of parliament, was “to S.F. Bradshaw, on account of the services of the Ocean Steam Navigation, £3,809 10s. 7d.” The whole of that claim had been settled last session, by £24,000 being given to the company; a much larger sum than they were entitled to. And here was an additional sum paid away by the government, without consulting parliament.¹²³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said the amount put down in the Estimates last year was £24,000, but it was found that the amount actually due was £27,809, so that an additional £3,809 had to be paid.¹²⁴

MR. BROWN said that last session it was admitted on all hands that the company had failed in their contract, and were entitled to nothing; but in order to get rid of their claim altogether and finally, £24,000 was voted to them, a sum which he considered at the time as by far too much. — But it was only on the condition of its being a final settlement of the whole claim, that Parliament made the grant, and the Government had taken too much on themselves when they gave away that additional £4,000. How did the house know that the matter was closed even yet, or that the Government might not give the company another £5,000? He considered it a most unconstitutional proceeding on the part of the Government, that they should pick out all the items likely to be objected to in the house, and pay them away without the authority of Parliament, embracing them in one line of the estimates — “To so and so, £102,000.”¹²⁵

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said that a considerable proportion of the whole amount, consisted of the unavoidable expenses connected with the removal of the Seat of Government.¹²⁶

MR. BROWN then referred to another item — “to re-imburse the Bank of Upper Canada so much advanced by it, on account of allowance to Enrolled Pensioners in Upper Canada, in lieu of land — £6,102 15s. 6d.” He said, the Parliament had this session been asked to pass an Act to enable certain pensioners to commute their land for money, and now it appeared that the money was actually paid them,

before the Bill was introduced! If the Government could act in that manner, what was the use of their bringing in Bills at all? Mr. Brown proceeded to comment on several other items of the expenditure of £102,000, and severely censured the Government for spending so large an amount of the public money, without asking the sanction of Parliament.¹²⁷

MR. J.S. MACDONALD remarked on certain items of expenditure in the same Statement A of the Public Accounts, connected with the forwarding of emigrants. He thought there should be some limit to the expenditure under that head.¹²⁸

MR. MACKENZIE objected at some length to spending the public money in this way, without getting the assent of the house in a fair way. Here was a lot of sums given away to favourites of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and most of the expenditure contained in this large item of upwards of £100,000 was unjustifiable. He had always advocated economy and still would do so, because it was for the people's benefit. What right had the Clerk of the Legislative Council to have a house built for him adjoining that Chamber? And should £27,000 and odd pounds be squandered away upon repairing the Governor General's residence? Why the hon. gentlemen opposite bade defiance and ever were refusing to give information called for. He also objected to the expenditure for the Addresses of Lord Elgin scattered abroad in French and English. Here the house was asked in one large sum to vote away a number of items of expenditure without knowing scarcely anything about them. He felt how little what he might say would be heeded, but he would not be silent upon such subjects. — He then reviewed other items, and objected and said, it was like stabbing the very vitals of the constitution to allow of such a state of things proceeding.¹²⁹

The item of £102,015 16s 6d was then carried.¹³⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY then moved the adoption of the item of £8,000, "Expenses for the services of 150 of the embodied pensioners on permanent duty in Upper Canada for the year 1856."¹³¹

MR. MACKENZIE strongly objected to it, much upon the same grounds as to the previous item.¹³²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY then moved the next item of £2433 6s 8d, "for compensation to Pensioners in lieu of land."¹³³

MR. MACKENZIE objected¹³⁴.

[Both items] were carried.¹³⁵

[The next item was] £300 for the salary of a Medical Superintendent for criminal lunatics at the Penitentiary¹³⁶.

[It] was objected to by MR. MACKENZIE, who intimated that it was merely a reward for political services.¹³⁷

[The item was] carried.¹³⁸

The next item[s], £500 for contingent expenses of the Penitentiary, £1707 for balance of tonnage duties at Quebec, £2731 3s. 2d. for emigration expenses, and £3000, towards emigration expenses for the present year, £221 1s. 10d. for balance of expense of water police at Quebec, and £730 [sic] for a deficiency in the same fund for the present year, were carried unopposed.¹³⁹

To the next item of £1750, "for expenses of River Police of Montreal during the past winter,"¹⁴⁰

MR. BROWN objected.¹⁴¹

MR. HOLTON supported it¹⁴².

DR. CLARKE did not see why the Province should pay for the support of such a River Police.¹⁴³

MR. AT. GEN. CARTIER and MR. HOLTON stated that the police was a most efficient body; it had at one time been disbanded, but it was found necessary to re-organize it, and had been found most serviceable in preserving peace on the canals, and in several parts of the Province. If it had not been for them the Corrigan murderers would never [have] been caught; and as their duties carry them beyond the immediate vicinity of Montreal, the whole expense of the force cannot properly be thrown on that city.¹⁴⁴ Mr. Holton [also] explained that that city paid a portion of the expense, but the Province was only expected to pay for those who were employed on the Public Works.¹⁴⁵

MR. BOWES did not see why Toronto should not have the same River Police, and he agreed that the Province should not be called upon to pay.¹⁴⁶

MR. BROWN again objected very strongly to the item¹⁴⁷.

A division was called for, which resulted in the item being carried.¹⁴⁸

The item[s] £50 for a safe for the Court House at St. Francis, and £142 14s. 4d. for the expenses of a detachment of enrolled pensioners at Fort Malden, Amherstburgh, were unopposed.¹⁴⁹

Upon the item being moved "For the formation of a collection of Canadian products, to be placed in the Sydenham Crystal Palace, London, including the remuneration and travelling expenses of Mr. Perry, £2,000,"¹⁵⁰

MR. BROWN called upon the Government for that explanation which the subject demanded.¹⁵¹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said, at the close of the Paris Exhibition a number of the Canadian products exhibited there were reserved, and a communication was made to the Association in London, to know upon what terms they would afford room for these articles in the Crystal Palace at Sydenham. The answer received was, that if the Canadian Government would put their manufactures in a reasonable shape, and make provision for their exhibition, that they would give room for them free of expense, and it was thought desirable, therefore, to make an appropriation annually, so as to keep up the Canadian Department at Sydenham, and to employ necessary means for doing that.¹⁵²

MR. BROWN thought it was indispensable that in the first place, the matter should have been submitted to the house before such an item as this was placed in the Estimates. (Hear, hear.) Their opinion should have been obtained upon the propriety of adopting the course suggested, and they should have been made fully acquainted with the whole plan for transmitting products from this country with any such views as the hon. gentleman set forth.¹⁵³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said, it was not now too late for the house to make objection if it did not meet their approval.¹⁵⁴

MR. BROWN could not avoid expressing his great surprise that the matter should be brought forward in its present form. It had been concluded upon since Parliament had been sitting; Messrs. Perry and Logan had been in Toronto a large portion of the time, and a committee should have been appointed to take the matter into consideration.¹⁵⁵ Some information ought to have been laid before ... [the House] by Sir W. Logan and Mr. Perry.¹⁵⁶

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied that if the Government had taken the course pointed out by the member for Lambton, the Government would have been charged by that gentleman with handing over its functions to a committee.¹⁵⁷ It was a very proper expenditure of the public money.¹⁵⁸ The effect to be produced from an exhibition of Canadian products in the capitals of Europe had been found already extensively beneficial to the interests of Canada, and would be well worthy of a trifling expenditure for the purpose of increasing that benefit.¹⁵⁹ If the house now agreed to it, let there be an annual vote, and whatever gentleman may be appointed to the office could make an annual report to this house, and it could see whether any advantage was or was not being derived from the course followed in keeping up the Canadian section of contributions.¹⁶⁰

MR. MERRITT thought it was a useless expenditure, and was not calculated to produce any benefit to the commerce of the country. The public expenditure of the Province this year was £1,500,000 greater than that of last year, and here they were going to make a larger one by squandering public money for a purpose quite useless to the country.¹⁶¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD also questioned the propriety of demanding money for the exposition at the Crystal Palace without any information being laid before the House. He had heard it said that Mr. Perry had actually been employed by the Government at a salary of £500 a year to take charge of the Canadian part of the exhibition. He would like to know if this were true. If it were, he thought the Government highly blameable for not taking the sense of the House as to the expediency of making that outlay before engaging Mr. Perry.¹⁶² It was a most objectionable act of the government, and it was the foundation of presenting a snug little berth to one of their (the government's) particular friends, on account of political influence. (Hear, hear.) And after the house had been kept in total darkness on the subject, were they now to grant £2,000 for such purposes? What had the country gained by exhibiting Canadian products at the Paris exhibition? Why, nothing at all.¹⁶³

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY stated that Mr. Perry had not been permanently employed by the Government. He had refused to accept any permanent engagement, but had consented to take charge of the removal of the goods from Paris to London, and fitting them up at the Crystal Palace.¹⁶⁴

MR. HOLTON thought that a distinct resolution should have been brought forward for the appointment of a committee, before the proposed grant was placed in the estimates. But¹⁶⁵ [he] regretted to hear that Mr. Perry's employment was only of a temporary character, for¹⁶⁶ Mr. Perry, in his mind, was just the very best person who could have been selected to carry out the contemplated arrangement, although he said so from no political bias. The object itself was a good one.¹⁶⁷ The utility of that great exhibition he believed to be much underrated by the member for Lincoln.¹⁶⁸

The vote was then put and carried.¹⁶⁹

It being six o'clock, the house took a recess.¹⁷⁰

On the resumption of the debate,¹⁷¹

[The next item was moved.]

MR. MACKENZIE asked how much per day the members of the Law Commission were to get out of the £6,000 voted for the expenses of the law commission?¹⁷²

This item was then agreed to.¹⁷³

The next item of £2,000 for compiling the index, was carried without any debate.¹⁷⁴

On the motion for the adoption of the next item of £1,111 to Upper Canada College,¹⁷⁵

MR. BROWN asked when this grant was to cease. This institution had a large endowment, which he thought should be sufficient to maintain it.¹⁷⁶

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY explained that the fee for tuition had been reduced one half.¹⁷⁷

MR. FREEMAN desired [sic] to know how it was that the endowment was not sufficient. He desired some further explanation. The return he had obtained was not sufficiently full.¹⁷⁸

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that he as an individual saw no reason why hereafter Upper Canada College, which was a preparatory school for the University, should not be chargeable upon the funds of that institution.¹⁷⁹

The item was then agreed to.¹⁸⁰

The following items were then passed: — Victoria College, £750; Queen's College, £750; Regiopolis College, £750; Grammar Schools of the Counties of Brant, Elgin, Grey, Lambton, Ontario and Halton, £100 each — £600; St. Michael's College, £350.¹⁸¹

[The next item was] — Episcopal Methodist College, Belleville, £350.¹⁸²

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY proposed to strike out the ... item, which had been inserted by mistake, and to insert the Roman Catholic College at Bytown.¹⁸³

MR. BROWN pointed out the unfairness of making grants to three Roman Catholic Colleges in Upper Canada, while only two Protestant Colleges received aid, although the Roman Catholics formed only one-sixth¹⁸⁴ [OR] one-ninth¹⁸⁵ of the entire population. He opposed those sectarian grants altogether.¹⁸⁶

The item was then agreed to.¹⁸⁷

£5000 for Superior Education in Lower Canada, and £35,000 for Common Schools in Upper and Lower Canada, was next agreed to.¹⁸⁸

On the item "£24,000 sterling for Ocean Steam Navigation,"¹⁸⁹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY stated that this was the amount of the contract transferred from M'Lean and M'Larry to Edmonstone and Allan. There were to be four vessels, to make fourteen semi-monthly, and five monthly trips, and to carry the mails.¹⁹⁰

MR. HOLTON said that he thought the Inspector General had in this made a most advantageous contract; it was now in proper hands, and the service had been most efficiently performed. He thought however, that the Government should have obtained the sanction of Parliament before going into a new contract.¹⁹¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD admired the extreme cordiality between the member for Montreal and the Inspector General on all matters relating to Montreal except the tariff. He thought, however, the contract a most advantageous one.¹⁹²

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD explained that this was merely a transfer of an arrangement formerly sanctioned by Parliament.¹⁹³

There was a short discussion [on this item], hon. members generally expressing the feeling that in the hands of Messrs. Edmondstone [sic] and Allan the contract would be well performed.¹⁹⁴

[The item was agreed to.]

The next item [agreed to] was £6,750 for tug service between Kingston and Montreal.¹⁹⁵

[On] the item for "Tug service below Quebec, £11,300," to Mr. Baby,¹⁹⁶

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY repeated the explanation he formerly gave on this item. The amount had been increased on account of its being found desirable to have a different class of vessels, built of iron and propelled by the screw, as better calculated to encounter the ice in the gulf. It was also agreed that they should go further down the gulf.¹⁹⁷

MR. HOLTON enquired if an advance had not been made to Mr. Baby of £30,000, and what security had been given?¹⁹⁸

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY stated that the advance included the first year's service, and security had been given on the vessels before the advance was made, which was given when the vessels were launched.¹⁹⁹

[There was] some discussion, and remarks by various members on the reckless expenditure by the Government on the Baby contracts.²⁰⁰

[The item was agreed to.]

The next item of £10,000 for arms for militia, was agreed to.²⁰¹

On the grant of £52,090 18s. 9d. being moved for to meet deficiencies of the Post Office revenue for 1855 and 1856,²⁰²

MR. BROWN objected.²⁰³

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE supported the vote of money.²⁰⁴

MR. BROWN argued that the Postmaster General should be prepared to give every information as to what he expected to be the increased correspondence, and all the results to be obtained from an increase of rates of postage. The proposed grant was most objectionable. Why should the hon. gentleman call upon the house for it? Three-penny postage was an experiment, as also the taking off of the postage upon newspapers; and the house ought to be informed what has been the effect of that upon the increase of correspondence and addition to the mails.²⁰⁵

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE deemed it absurd to increase the rate of postage or to reduce it. It was true that it was an experiment in 1851, and it was no doubt a great public boon, which was conferred upon the community when the newspaper postage was taken off, since which the newspaper mails had been very much heavier; besides he looked upon that step as one that had promoted the purposes of education for the people. And he could not see why the postage should be still made to apply to peculiar periodicals. He did not think that the deficiency set forth was unreasonable, in view of the present state of the department.²⁰⁶

MR. BROWN insisted that the house should be better informed upon the subject. Did the Postmaster General expect a reduction or increase in the deficiency for the future?²⁰⁷

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE hoped a reduction.²⁰⁸

MR. MACKENZIE attacked the Postmaster General in the management of his department. Not only was this deficiency sought to be made up by this vote, but there were other items down in the Public Accounts for that department. The hon. gentleman had a perfect *carte blanche* to do as he pleased, no accounts of receipts and expenditures did the house obtain. Not a bit of it. A change was wanted in that Post Office, and must soon take place. No wonder that the Postmaster General's constituents were to meet to-day to consider his honesty and fitness as their representative when the department over which he now presided was conducted in such an extraordinary style. (Hear, hear.) Why should a Postmaster General sit in the House of Assembly?²⁰⁹

MR. FREEMAN would like the Inspector General to explain if he had made any provision for paying the sums ordered for the Administration of Justice in Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) Great expense for conducting it was thrown upon the Counties, while it ought to be borne by the Government. This was felt to be a serious grievance in Upper Canada.²¹⁰

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY had received information from several quarters about it, and he had drawn the attention of the Auditors of the proper department to it.²¹¹

MR. HARTMAN said, the United Counties of York and Peel had to bear an unjust proportion of the expenses of the Administration of Criminal Justice, and he was at a loss to know the reason of it.²¹²

MR. J.S. MACDONALD complained that there was no universal audit throughout the country.²¹³

The vote was then put and carried.²¹⁴

MR. BROWN called the attention of the Inspector General to these next items which were the expenses of the Collection of Public Revenue amounting to £150,500. Those expenses had risen ten per cent. since last year upon the declared Revenue²¹⁵, which is sheer waste and extravagance²¹⁶. (Hear, hear.) This demanded most particular attention. It was only a few years ago that the expense of collection was four per cent., and it went to prove how great a loss had been sustained to the country by direct taxation.²¹⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY appeared surprised.²¹⁸

MR. BROWN reiterated this last remark.²¹⁹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY admitted that it might be so one year, but the average was much above that.²²⁰

MR. MACKENZIE hastily declared the whole thing to be a job (laughter) and a most shameful disgrace to the Government.²²¹

MR. J.S. MACDONALD objected to the action taken by the Inspector General in his department. He did not even do what the other departments did. The house could get no satisfactory explanations, and the Clerks in his department they had not the least controul over; and although²²² there was a law passed some years ago requiring every Head of a Department to consult the executive council before appointing a Clerk²²³, he neglected doing so, and left the sole patronage and disposition in himself, and he had appointed and now employed more clerks in his department than even his colleagues were aware of.²²⁴ The Inspector General has a very large share of patronage at his disposal, and the appointment of new officers every day is one cause of the largely increased expenditure of the Customs Department.²²⁵ The same thing took place with the Commissioner of Crown Lands.²²⁶ He understands that the Commissioner pays no attention to that law, and has appointed a large staff of clerks of his motion.²²⁷

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY had fewer Clerks in his office than when he came into it. He denied that such patronage was vested wholly in his or other departments, and if it were he would rather be relieved from exercising it, and throw upon the house the disagreeable necessity of having to refuse on every occasion thirty to forty applicants for a situation. Permanent appointments to Clerkships in his department were only made with the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General, each officer having a certain maximum salary fixed upon him. The expenses of the department certainly had been much increased by the necessity of opening numerous inland ports, in consequence of the commencement of working of Railroads.²²⁸

MR. BROWN thought it requisite for the house to be placed in the proper position to judge of the necessity for such an increase of expenses. The increase could not be so very much.²²⁹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY felt that the hon. member wanted to cripple the departments, by advancing such objections. It was done for cavilling.²³⁰

MR. BROWN was surprised at such an assertion. Could it be said, that because he objected to an expenditure of £70,000 a year now, while it only was £30,000 the other day, that his purpose was to cavil. It was an unjust presumption. Was not such an extraordinary increase in expenditure taking place in all the various branches of the Public Service? It was not to be denied for a moment, and it was a matter demanding most serious attention. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cayley) would find too that this state of things would not much longer be submitted to in this country. (Hear, hear.)²³¹

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY denied that the increase of ten per cent. had taken place.²³²

MR. BROWN observed, that there was as much revenue got in 1851 for the £30,000 expenses of collection, as now was obtained for £70,000. (Hear, hear.)²³³

MR. J.S. MACDONALD objected in a detailed manner to the items of expense.²³⁴

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON defended himself in appointing Clerks to his Department.²³⁵ The member for Glengarry had charged him with having employed a large staff of clerks without consulting the Council. The fact is that he had two clerks less in his department now than there were in it when he entered it, and not a single permanent clerk was appointed without the Council being consulted. There were three permanent clerks less than last year. He was obliged to take one supernumery [sic] in Mr. Russell's department, after that gentleman had several times asked for assistance on his own responsibility.²³⁶ He had acted in no objectionable manner in other respects.²³⁷

MR. MACKENZIE accused the Commissioner of Crown Lands of giving printing to his own paper, the *Journal of Quebec*, while that paper was abusing the Government for the only liberal thing they ever did. He went on to refer to various places in Lower Canada where the collector received more than the revenue collected. At Rimouski the collector collected nothing and received £100 for collecting it.²³⁸

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON asked if the member for Haldimand had not his son employed at \$3 per day. (Cries of order.)²³⁹ [He] admitted that he had given the printing patronage to his own brother-in-law in Quebec²⁴⁰. He distributed the printing among the friends of the Government of whom was Mr. Cote, printer of the *Journal de Quebec*²⁴¹, and he considered that that was a proper principle to go upon.²⁴²

MR. WILSON asked if the Crown Land Patents were not furnished at 1s. 6d. a piece formerly, and that now when printed by Mr. Cauchon's brother-in-law, they cost 5s. a piece.²⁴³

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said that on the contrary, the price was reduced from 5s. to 1s. 6d.²⁴⁴ [OR] they formerly cost 7s. 6d. and they now cost 5s.²⁴⁵

MR. MACKENZIE said that he had been thirty or forty years serving the country, and if he or his son did receive something from the public service, it was well deserved. But it was not true; his son had been for a few weeks employed as an extra writer, but he had sent him back to his own business. It was a most unfair attack.²⁴⁶

MR. BROWN said this was a most unjust attack. The young man had been paid at the same rate as other extra writers and was spoken of as being very efficient.²⁴⁷

MR. WILSON again put his question as to whether the patents which formerly cost 1s. 6d. did not now cost 5s. at the Journal office. He also wanted to know what was the Geological department attached to the Crown Land department.²⁴⁸

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said that he had already answered the first question.²⁴⁹

MR. BROWN understood that the Commissioner of Crown Lands had established a Geological department in his office, as a sort of opposition to Sir William Logan's. Was that true?²⁵⁰

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS. — Bah! bah!²⁵¹

MR. BROWN. — The interruption of the Sol. General is not very seemly.²⁵²

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS. — I have a perfect right to say Bah! bah! (Laughter.)²⁵³

MR. BROWN admitted that the hon. gentleman had a right to say bah! bah! The nature of the animal would speak. (Laughter.) He also understood that the Crown Lands Commissioner had selected a Mr. Hayes to conduct the settlement of some new district. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would oblige the house with an explanation on that point.²⁵⁴

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said the road was back of Peterboro', and he believed Mr. Hayes was a gentleman of that neighbourhood. He did not know the length of the road, or the townships it passed through; but he could give the information on some future occasion, if called for. As to Mr. De Rottermund and the Geological Department, an order in Council had been passed for examining not only the mines on Lakes Huron and Superior, but the soil, that it might be seen what lands were capable of settlement. It was not properly a Geological Department, but an exploration of the mines of the government; and it could not be given to Sir William Logan, because he was then in England. He did not intend to make the matter permanent, and hoped the exploration would be finished this summer.²⁵⁵ It would take two years to complete the whole Survey.²⁵⁶

MR. WILSON wished to know the extent of the staff, and their salaries.²⁵⁷

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said that Mr. De Rottermund had no staff except in the field, and it was of course required there for purposes of locomotion, as he had no wings, and could not swim. Mr. Salter, the surveyor, had six dollars a day when in the field²⁵⁸ [OR] Mr. Salter received 30s per day, but he was not permanently employed.²⁵⁹

MR. WILSON said he had not yet got information as to the expense of this new Geological Department.²⁶⁰

In reply to MR. BROWN,²⁶¹

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH made some further explanations about the road which was being opened up through a new district in the rear of Peterboro'.²⁶²

MR. BROWN asked if Mr. Hayes, selected to open up the district, was the same Mr. Hayes who acted as the Secretary of the Buffalo Convention.²⁶³

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said he could not tell.²⁶⁴

In reply to further questions,

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON stated that the land was to be given in lots of 50 acres each, as free grants, on the condition of settlement duties being performed.²⁶⁵

After some further discussion, the item was agreed to.²⁶⁶

The following items under estimate of the public works for the completion of works in progress were then carried...: — £4100 for forming and protecting foundation of light house on Pointe Pelee Reef; ... £13,049 for lanterns, &c., for light houses in course of construction; £15,000 for light houses in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Straits of Belleisle; £8000 for lanterns, lamps, &c., for light houses in the Gulf of St. Lawrence; £7634 for Scugog navigation; £2700 for River Ottawa works; £2255 for River St. Maurice works; £2000 for Burlington Bay Canal; £3500 for dredging vessels, &c.; £5680 for completion of Marine Hospital at Quebec; £1500 for completion of Hamilton Post Office; £7436 for repairs and rents of public buildings; £19,000 for expenditure on removal of Seat of Government; £28,000 for public buildings, &c., at Toronto since 1st Jan.; £3000 for light houses on Snake Island, Lake Ontario; £8500 for slides, &c., on the St. Maurice River; £50,000 [sic] for the improvement of the Ottawa navigation²⁶⁷; £1850 for roads near the Saguenay; £2,500 for Richelieu rapid; £2000 for Hamilton Custom House; £2500 for London Post Office; building for female lunatics at Toronto, £1200.²⁶⁸

MR. BROWN objected to the item of "£8,000 for Light Houses on Lake Huron." He understood that no tenders had been called for, and that the work had been given at rates far exceeding what other responsible parties would have done it for.²⁶⁹

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX admitted that the work had not been given out to public competition, but stated that it had been done at the same rates as had been given for similar work by the Northern Railroad.²⁷⁰

[The item was also carried.]

On the item of "£50,000, towards erection of Public Buildings in Quebec,"²⁷¹

MR. BROWN said that at that late hour there was no necessity for further discussion of the question. He presumed the best course was to take a division at once.²⁷²

Members then divided to the right and left of the chair, and the vote was carried by 43 to 35.²⁷³

The remaining items, viz: Survey of the Ottawa, £5,000; surveys generally, £5,000; arbitration awards, &c., £20,000, were generally agreed to.²⁷⁴

The Committee then rose and reported.²⁷⁵

(578)

and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. *Casault* reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be received on Monday next.

(579)

Mr. *Casault* also acquainted the House, that he was directed to move, That the Committee may have leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

A Message from the Legislative Council, by *John Fennings Taylor*, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery: —

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council have passed the Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend and consolidate the several Acts incorporating and relating to the Bank of *Montreal*," with several Amendments, to which they desire the concurrence of this House.

And then he withdrew.

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General *Cartier*, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, laid before the House, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, — Annual Report of the Normal, Model, Grammar, and Common Schools for *Upper Canada*, for the year 1855.

For the said Annual Report, see Appendix (No. 16.)

Then, on motion of the Honorable *John Sandfield Macdonald*, seconded by Mr. *Mackenzie*, The House adjourned.²⁷⁶

Appendix

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: BANKS.]

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY [gave notice that he would move for leave to introduce a Bill] to limit the issue of registered bank-notes to free banking institutioⁿ [sic] to four-fifths of the amount of debentures deposited with the Receiver-General by way of security to the Province.²⁷⁷

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: ADDITIONAL AID TO THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.]

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY [gave notice that he would move the following resolutions] in Committee of the Whole.

RESOLVED —

1. That, for the purpose of enabling the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to complete their undertaking, it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to carry into effect an arrangement provisionally entered into between the Government of Canada and the said Company, based upon the following terms, viz: —

That the Railway Company shall be allowed to issue preferential bonds to the extent of two millions sterling; the holders of such bonds to have priority of claim therefor, over the present first lien of the Province.

That such issue shall not take place until the railway from St. Thomas, Lower Canada, to Stratford, Upper Canada, shall have been finished and in operation.

That the proceeds of the said bonds shall be paid over to the Provincial Agents in London, and released on the certificates of the Receiver General upon proof of progress of the work.

That the said proceeds shall be appropriated to the aid or construction of the following works and in the proportion hereinafter mentioned.

The Railways from St. Mary's to London and Sarnia	£450,000
The Railway from St. Thomas, L.C., to Riviere-du-Loup	525,000
Victoria Bridge	800,000
Three Rivers [sic] and Arthabaska	125,000
To enable the Grand Trunk to assist subsidiary lines, such as the Port Hope, Cobourg and Prescott	100,000
	<hr/>
	£2,000,000

That the St. Mary's and London branch and subsidiary lines shall be completed by the	1st Sept. 1857.
Stratford and Sarnia	1st Sept. 1858.
Arthabaska and Three Rivers	1st Sept. 1859.
The Victoria Bridge	1st Jan. 1860.

St. Thomas and Riviere-du-Loup line as follows:

From St. Thomas to Riviere Ouelle	1st Jan. 1859.
From Riviere Ouelle to Riviere-du-Loup	1st Jan. 1860.

That in order to restore to the Trois Pistoles Road, the guarantee diverted from it by the Act of 1854 and expended on the Toronto and Stratford section, there shall be reserved from the proceeds of the Preferential Bonds as they are paid over to the Provincial Agents such a portion for the section of the Road from St. Thomas to Riviere-du-Loup, as shall ensure its progress equally with the other works above mentioned.

That the interest accruing on the Provincial bonds during the period of five years, being the time necessary for the completion of the works and for the development of the through traffic, shall be advanced by the Province, and such advances as they are made shall be repaid to the Province in share capital of the Company.

That the lien of the Province, subject to the preceding condition, shall rank, as to dividend or interest, with that of the Company's bond-holders.²⁷⁸

Footnotes

1. In accordance with the resolution passed on 3 June 1856, the House assembled at ten o'clock.
2. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
6. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
7. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
8. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*

17. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856. *Globe*, 7 June 1856, reports that the next item on the Orders of the day was — “Receiving Report of Committee of Whole on Bill for incorporation of Religious and other Societies — Hon. Mr. Drummond,” and that Mr. Cayley asked “that item 73 be taken up” instead.
18. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
19. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
24. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
25. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
26. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
27. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
28. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
29. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
30. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
31. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
35. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
36. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
37. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
38. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
39. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
40. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
41. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
42. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856, reports a different statement, as follows: “Besides they might as well provide His Excellency a box at the theatre, if he were fond of theatricals. Both proposals were equally objectionable.” The speech reported in *Globe*, 7 June 1856, is almost identical to that in the *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*.
43. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
46. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
47. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
50. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
51. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
52. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856.
56. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
57. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
58. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
59. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
62. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856, specifies that the gentleman “was cried down, especially by the French members.”
63. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
64. *Globe*, 7 June 1856, *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856, and *Mackenzie's Weekly Message*, 13 June 1856, all differ from the *Journals* and report that the amendment was lost on a division of 24 Yeas to 57 Nays.
65. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.

66. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
69. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
70. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. This newspaper also reports that Mr. J.A. Macdonald "spoke in a very subdued tone of voice".
75. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
79. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
80. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
81. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
82. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
83. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. This newspaper and *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856, report commentaries regarding Mr. Gould's contract with the Post Office Department.
86. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
87. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
90. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *Ibid.*
93. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
94. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
95. *Ibid.*
96. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
97. *Ibid.*
98. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
99. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
100. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
101. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
102. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856.
103. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
104. *Ibid.*
105. *Ibid.*
106. *Ibid.*
107. *Ibid.*
108. *Ibid.*
109. *Ibid.*
110. *Ibid.*
111. *Ibid.*
112. *Ibid.*
113. *Ibid.*
114. *Ibid.*
115. *Ibid.*
116. *Ibid.*
117. *Ibid.*
118. *Ibid.*
119. *Ibid.*
120. *Ibid.*

121. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
122. *Ibid.*
123. *Ibid.*
124. *Ibid.*
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Ibid.*
127. *Ibid.*
128. *Ibid.*
129. *Ibid.*
130. *Ibid.*
131. *Ibid.*
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*
134. *Ibid.*
135. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
136. *Ibid.*
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Ibid.*
139. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856. According to the resolutions reported in the *Journals* of 9 June 1856, and to the tables of supplies in the *Journals* Index, the amount agreed to for the deficiency in the fund of the Quebec Water Police was £750.
140. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
141. *Ibid.*
142. *Ibid.*
143. *Ibid.*
144. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
145. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
146. *Ibid.*
147. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856, briefly reports that the item "was opposed by Messrs. Brown, Clarke, and Bowes, who declared it to be mere extravagance to impose this charge on the whole Province when it ought to be borne by Montreal alone."
148. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
149. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
150. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
151. *Ibid.*
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Ibid.*
154. *Ibid.*
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
157. *Ibid.*
158. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
159. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
160. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
161. *Ibid.*
162. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
163. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
164. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
165. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
166. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
167. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
168. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
169. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
170. *Ibid.*
171. *Ibid.*
172. *Ibid.*

173. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
174. *Ibid.*
175. *Ibid.*
176. *Ibid.*
177. *Ibid.*
178. *Ibid.*
179. *Ibid.*
180. *Ibid.*
181. *Ibid.*
182. *Ibid.*
183. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
184. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
185. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
186. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
187. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856. According to the resolutions reported in the *Journals* of 9 June 1856, and to the tables of supplies in the *Journals* Index, the amount of £200 was agreed to for the College at Bytown.
188. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
189. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
190. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
191. *Ibid.*
192. *Ibid.*
193. *Ibid.*
194. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
195. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
196. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
197. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
198. *Ibid.*
199. *Ibid.*
200. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
201. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
202. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
203. *Ibid.*
204. *Ibid.*
205. *Ibid.*
206. *Ibid.*
207. *Ibid.*
208. *Ibid.*
209. *Ibid.*
210. *Ibid.*
211. *Ibid.*
212. *Ibid.*
213. *Ibid.*
214. *Ibid.*
215. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856, reports that Mr. Brown "called the attention of the Inspector General to the expense of collecting the Custom's Revenue £70,000," an amount which he does specify later on in the discussion.
216. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
217. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
218. *Ibid.*
219. *Ibid.*
220. *Ibid.*
221. *Ibid.*
222. *Ibid.*
223. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
224. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
225. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
226. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.

227. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
228. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
229. *Ibid.*
230. *Ibid.*
231. *Ibid.*
232. *Ibid.*
233. *Ibid.*
234. *Ibid.*
235. *Ibid.*
236. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
237. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
238. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
239. *Ibid.*
240. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
241. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
242. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
243. *Ibid.*
244. *Ibid.*
245. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
246. *Ibid.*
247. *Ibid.*
248. *Ibid.*
249. *Ibid.*
250. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
251. *Ibid.*
252. *Ibid.*
253. *Ibid.*
254. *Ibid.*
255. *Ibid.*
256. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
257. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
258. *Ibid.*
259. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
260. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
261. *Ibid.*
262. *Ibid.*
263. *Ibid.*
264. *Ibid.*
265. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856, reports a commentary on the short discussion that took place regarding the settlement of lands in the county of Peterborough.
266. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
267. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856. According to the resolutions reported in the *Journals* of 9 June 1856, and to the tables of supplies in the *Journals* Index, the amount agreed to for the improvement of the Ottawa navigation was £25,000.
268. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856. According to this newspaper, these items were carried "after violent opposition from Mr. Mackenzie, in the course of which he lost his voice".
269. *Globe*, 7 June 1856.
270. *Ibid.*
271. *Ibid.*
272. *Ibid.*
273. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856, also reports that "the Committee divided at once without any discussion". *Globe*, 7 June 1856, reports additional information, as follows: "The following Upper Canadian members voted for the appropriation: Messrs. J.A. Macdonald, Spence, Cayley, Powell, Clarke, and Larwill." In a commentary, this newspaper further notes that Mr. H. Smith also voted for the grant, and that "as usual, many Upper Canadian members were absent from their seats — or the vote could not have been passed." *Montreal Gazette*, 10 June 1856, notes that "the reception of the report of the committee of supply is fixed for Monday evening, when every opposition will be made to the final passage of the appropriation." Another commentary is reported in *Pilot*, 10 June 1856.

274. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856.
275. *Morning Chronicle*, 11 June 1856. *Globe*, 7 June 1856, reports a short commentary, as follows: "The Lower House was engaged from 10 yesterday morning till after midnight with the Supplies. All the items were gone through and carried, after much discussion. The concurrence of the House upon the several appropriations will be formally taken up on Monday evening, and the names of members recorded."
276. According to *Globe*, 7 June 1856, the House adjourned "at ten minutes past twelve", whereas *Toronto Daily Leader*, 7 June 1856, reports "at half-past one o'clock."
- Globe*, 7 June 1856, further reports that before the House adjourned, "it was also arranged that Private Bills should be taken up on Monday till six o'clock, and that the remainder of the evening should be devoted to Government measures."
277. *Montreal Gazette*, 10 June 1856.
278. *Globe*, 7 June 1856. This newspaper also reports a commentary on Mr. Cayley's resolutions.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

INTRODUCTION

The following Index applies only to the names of men who were members of the Legislative Assembly in the Fifth Parliament, Second Session, for the period covered in this volume, that is 15 May 1856 to 6 June 1856 inclusive. It refers to every occasion a member proposed or seconded a motion or resolution, or brought up a petition; it refers to every speech he delivered during debates or to every other time he addressed the House; and also when he took the chair of the House in Committee of the Whole, or was appointed to sit on a Committee. Only individual votes are excluded because divisions rightfully belong with the legislation they pertain to, and all legislation is included in the subject Index.

The letter "f" after the page number indicates a member's speech or motion referred to in the footnote pages. The punctuation (?) following a page number indicates there is reason to doubt that the member made the speech or moved the motion. The reader is advised to refer to the appropriate footnote in the footnote pages for an explanation.

As explained in the Introduction to this Volume, the subject Index for the entire Volume will be contained in the final part.

PROPER NAMES

A

Aikins, James Cox, 2155, 2180, 2254, 2422, 2424.

Alleyn, Charles, 2180, 2189-2190, 2212-2213, 2258, 2258-2259, 2259-2260, 2260, 2274, 2354, 2356, 2410.

B

Bell, Robert, 2127, 2179, 2180, 2341, 2409, 2420.

Bellingham, Sydney, 2048, 2061-2062, 2085, 2191, 2308, 2332, 2340, 2341, 2348-2349, 2383, 2399, 2405, 2405-2406, 2406, 2406-2407.

Biggar, Herbert, 2179.

Blanchet, Jean.

Bourassa, François, 2419.

Bowes, John George, 2117, 2130-2131, 2180, 2248, 2266-2267, 2275(?), 2341, 2342, 2355, 2358, 2410, 2430.

Brodeur, Timothée.

Brown, George, 2063-2064, 2064-2065, 2065-2066, 2066-2067, 2067, 2067-2068, 2068, 2068-2070, 2070, 2071, 2071-2072, 2072, 2074, 2075, 2075-2076, 2076, 2076-2077, 2077, 2091, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2101, 2102, 2105, 2117, 2127, 2132, 2151, 2153, 2160, 2164, 2166, 2169, 2180, 2184(?), 2187-2189, 2189, 2215, 2217, 2246, 2254, 2255, 2275(?), 2292, 2293, 2293-2294, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2296-2297, 2297, 2297-2300, 2300, 2300-2301, 2301, 2302-2304, 2304, 2304-2305, 2307, 2320, 2342, 2342-2343, 2344, 2349, 2352, 2354, 2355, 2376, 2376-2377, 2377-2378, 2378-2379, 2379-2380, 2380, 2380-2381, 2381, 2381-2382, 2382, 2382-2383, 2383, 2383-2384, 2410, 2414, 2420, 2421, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2428-2429, 2430, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437.

Bureau, Jacques Olivier, 2411.

Burton, Francis H., 2157-2158.

C

Cameron, John Hillyard, 2048, 2078, 2119, 2185.

Cartier, Georges Étienne, 2046, 2048, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2128, 2147, 2164-2165, 2165, 2165-2166, 2215-2216, 2244, 2255, 2291, 2315, 2317, 2320, 2320-2321, 2322, 2334, 2358, 2364, 2366, 2386, 2388, 2390, 2413, 2414, 2430, 2438.

Casault, Louis Eldemar Napoléon, 2169, 2254, 2273, 2411, 2420, 2437, 2438.

Cauchon, Joseph Édouard, 2110, 2110-2111, 2111-2112, 2197, 2208, 2227, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2246, 2300, 2332-2333, 2435, 2436, 2437.

Cayley, William, 2053-2054, 2054, 2067, 2068, 2072, 2072-2073, 2073-2074, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2105, 2106, 2132, 2153, 2167, 2228-2229, 2229, 2230-2231, 2232-2233, 2292, 2315, 2340, 2352, 2353, 2356, 2365, 2396, 2407, 2420, 2421, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2438, 2438-2439.

Chabot, Jean, 2055, 2180, 2211-2212, 2214, 2269, 2321, 2410, 2414.

Chapais, Jean Charles, 2180, 2410.

Chisholm, George King, 2045, 2153, 2183.

Christie, David, 2366.

Church, Basil Rorison, 2158.

Clarke, William, 2106, 2296, 2328, 2329, 2430.

Conger, Wilson Seymour, 2151, 2160, 2246, 2307, 2317, 2318, 2357, 2390-2391, 2391.

Cook, Ephraim.

Cooke, Alanson.

Crawford, George, 2153, 2273, 2410.

Crysler, John Pliny.

D

Daly, Thomas Mayne, 2160.

Daoust, Charles, 2146, 2146-2147, 2147, 2147-2148.

Daoust, Jean Baptiste, 2127, 2179, 2197.

Darche, Noël, 2127, 2180, 2197, 2221.

Delong, Jesse.

Desaulniers, Louis Léon Lesieur, 2408.

DeWitt, Jacob, 2085, 2222.

Dionne, Benjamin, 2085, 2179.

Dorion, Antoine Aimé, 2078, 2151, 2152(?), 2165, 2179, 2183-2184, 2184(?), 2213-2214, 2214, 2217, 2273, 2274, 2349-2351, 2352(?), 2356, 2357, 2363, 2363-2364, 2366, 2367, 2386(?), 2391, 2397, 2398, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2409, 2410, 2411.

Dorion, Jean Baptiste Éric, 2152(?), 2169, 2179, 2221, 2352(?), 2358, 2368, 2386(?), 2405, 2406, 2408, 2414.

Dostaler, Pierre Eustache.

Drummond, Lewis Thomas, 2048, 2147, 2167, 2168, 2238-2240, 2241, 2242, 2260, 2261, 2293, 2329-2331, 2331-2332, 2332, 2345-2346, 2346-2347, 2348, 2365, 2385-2386, 2409, 2410, 2414, 2415, 2419, 2420-2421, 2421.

Dufresne, Joseph, 2150-2151, 2261-2262, 2262-2263, 2263, 2379, 2384, 2390, 2396, 2401, 2407, 2410.

E

Egan, John.

Évanturel, François, 2190, 2384.

F

Fellowes (Lyon), George Byron, 2179, 2185-2186.

Felton, William Locker Pickmore, 2134-2135, 2141-2142, 2168, 2189, 2190, 2236, 2243, 2243-2244, 2244-2245, 2275, 2390, 2423.

Fergusson, Adam Johnston, 2044, 2087.

Ferres, James Moir, 2267-2269, 2341, 2342, 2390, 2424.

Ferrie, Robert.

Flint, Billa.

Foley, Michael Hamilton, 2118, 2143-2146, 2151, 2154, 2160, 2223, 2245-2246, 2246, 2247, 2317, 2318, 2353, 2405.

Fortier, Octave Cyrille, 2043, 2169(?).

Fortier, Thomas, 2169(?), 2182, 2363.

Fournier, Charles François, 2315.

Frazer, John, 2043.

Freeman, Samuel Black, 2340, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2419, 2432, 2434.

G

Galt, Alexander Tilloch, 2055-2056, 2056-2057, 2057-2058, 2058, 2072, 2096, 2110, 2113, 2131, 2134, 2154, 2224-2227, 2227-2228, 2229, 2233, 2243.

Gamble, John William, 2045, 2186, 2238, 2284, 2285-2286, 2286-2287, 2287, 2287-2288, 2288-2290, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2342, 2349, 2356, 2357, 2366, 2390, 2410, 2411.

Gill, Ignace.

Gould, Joseph, 2159, 2363, 2425.

Guévremont, Jean Baptiste, 2179, 2180, 2396.

H

Hartman, Joseph, 2046, 2152, 2164, 2273, 2341, 2354, 2410, 2411, 2413, 2434.

Holton, Luther Hamilton, 2049-2052, 2052, 2091, 2105, 2107, 2117, 2132, 2132-2133, 2134, 2150, 2154, 2155, 2166, 2169, 2184, 2217, 2222, 2223, 2274, 2279, 2283, 2318, 2325, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2410, 2412, 2421, 2423, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433.

Huot, Pierre Gabriel.

J

Jackson, George, 2113-2114, 2114-2115, 2115, 2116.

Jobin, Joseph Hilarion, 2221, 2425.

L

Labelle, Pierre.

Laberge, Charles Joseph, 2148-2150, 2373, 2388, 2399.

Laporte, Joseph.

Larwill, Edwin, 2054, 2070, 2071, 2114, 2118-2119, 2127, 2273, 2403-2404, 2404-2405, 2405, 2406.

LeBoutillier, John.

Lemieux, François Xavier, 2058-2059, 2168, 2260, 2260-2261, 2261, 2363, 2366, 2437.

Loranger, Thomas Jean Jacques, 2184, 2185, 2201, 2205-2208, 2209, 2219f, 2246, 2265, 2265-2266, 2284, 2348, 2356, 2365, 2380, 2382, 2384, 2387-2388, 2399, 2401, 2408, 2410.

Lumsden, John MacVeigh.

Lyon (see Fellowes).

M

Macbeth, George, 2152, 2153.

McCann, Henry Wellesly.

Macdonald, John Alexander, 2064, 2090, 2117, 2118, 2130, 2134, 2151, 2152, 2160-2161, 2161-2162, 2162-2163, 2164, 2197, 2200-2201, 2201, 2202-2203, 2209-2210, 2214, 2215, 2217, 2222, 2223, 2233-2235, 2235-2236, 2236-2237, 2237, 2237-2238, 2238, 2243, 2247-2248, 2256, 2274, 2277-2279, 2279, 2280-2281, 2281, 2281-2282, 2283, 2283-2284, 2284, 2286, 2288, 2291, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2315, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2342, 2343, 2351, 2352, 2354, 2357, 2364, 2367, 2368, 2373, 2374-2376, 2390, 2391, 2397, 2398, 2401-2402, 2410, 2412, 2421, 2422, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2428, 2431, 2432.

Macdonald, John Sandfield, 2181, 2182, 2182-2183, 2183, 2184, 2201-2202, 2204, 2205, 2210, 2237, 2282, 2317, 2333, 2334, 2342, 2343-2344, 2344, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2355, 2363, 2367, 2368-2371, 2372, 2372-2373, 2374, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2381, 2382, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2391, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2400, 2402, 2410, 2422-2423, 2423, 2427, 2429, 2431, 2432, 2434, 2435, 2438.

McDonald, Roderick, 2152, 2174f.

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 2062-2063, 2078, 2111, 2119, 2151, 2155, 2167, 2180, 2182, 2191, 2192, 2237, 2315, 2321, 2322, 2322-2324, 2331, 2342, 2344-2345, 2346, 2352, 2353, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2365, 2367-2368, 2368, 2386-2387, 2387, 2402, 2409, 2410, 2412, 2414, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2429, 2431, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2438, 2444f.

MacNab, Allan Napier, 2132, 2180, 2180-2181, 2189, 2198-2200, 2203, 2210, 2231-2232, 2233, 2269, 2274-2275, 2275, 2275-2277, 2279, 2282, 2294, 2296, 2351, 2365, 2373, 2374, 2400, 2402, 2423, 2424.

Marchildon, Thomas, 2061, 2179, 2217, 2306, 2374.

Masson, Luc Hyacinthe, 2117, 2160, 2295, 2301, 2304, 2307, 2308, 2358, 2387, 2400.

Matheson, Donald.

Mattice, William.

Meagher, John.

Merritt, William Hamilton, 2087, 2135, 2142-2143, 2254, 2292-2293, 2354, 2356, 2365, 2367, 2374, 2398, 2410, 2431.

Mongenais, Jean Baptiste, 2179, 2180, 2197.

Morrison, Angus, 2048, 2102, 2153, 2297.

Morrison, Joseph Curran, 2090.

Munro, Henry.

Murney, Edmund, 2048, 2092, 2095, 2100, 2117, 2119, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2154, 2155, 2156.

N

Niles, William E.

O

O'Farrell, John, 2117, 2119, 2143, 2307.

P

Papin, Joseph, 2049, 2119, 2147, 2151, 2168, 2243, 2281, 2366, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2410, 2420.

Patrick, William, 2059, 2059-2060, 2190-2191, 2208, 2260, 2318, 2347, 2348, 2355, 2391.

Polette, Antoine, 2411.

Poulin, Joseph Napoléon, 2245, 2410.

Pouliot, Barthelemy, 2265.

Powell, William Frederick, 2048, 2106-2107, 2107, 2107-2108, 2108-2110, 2118, 2150, 2308, 2325-2328, 2328, 2397-2398, 2398.

Prévost, Gédéon Mélasippe, 2197, 2273, 2419.

Price, David Edward.

R

Rankin, Arthur, 2060-2061, 2117, 2118, 2152, 2156, 2164, 2167, 2192-2193, 2209, 2210-2211, 2211, 2243, 2263-2265, 2280, 2308, 2324, 2324-2325, 2325.

Rhodes, William, 2119, 2151, 2158, 2208, 2248, 2256-2258, 2258, 2263, 2274, 2307, 2399.

Robinson, William Benjamin, 2099, 2118, 2156, 2159, 2182, 2187, 2193, 2223, 2246, 2273, 2287, 2305-2306, 2349, 2367, 2397.

Roblin, David, 2076, 2159, 2223.

Rolph, John, 2085.

Ross, Dunbar, 2071, 2192, 2340, 2358, 2419, 2436.

Ross, James.

S

Sanborn, John Sewell, 2138, 2138-2141, 2160, 2217, 2237, 2356, 2357, 2396, 2399-2400, 2403, 2406, 2408, 2420.

Scatcherd, John, 2043, 2151, 2154, 2158, 2160, 2187, 2423.

Shaw, James.

Sicotte, Louis Victor, 2043, 2048, 2054, 2056, 2072, 2075, 2088, 2092, 2114, 2117, 2127, 2128, 2135, 2147, 2180, 2214, 2282, 2324, 2325, 2333, 2339, 2342, 2351, 2364, 2371-2372, 2372, 2388, 2397, 2402, 2408, 2423, 2424, 2425.

Smith, Henry, 2117, 2130, 2133-2134, 2147, 2151, 2156, 2179, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2193, 2197, 2211, 2215, 2217, 2222, 2223, 2256, 2274, 2290, 2291, 2308, 2315, 2317, 2318, 2322, 2324, 2325, 2334, 2342, 2344, 2353, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2368, 2398, 2398-2399, 2402, 2406, 2410, 2419, 2426, 2427, 2437.

Smith, James, 2043, 2044, 2085, 2091(?), 2092(?), 2092, 2100, 2157, 2221, 2355, 2391, 2408.

Smith, Sidney, 2091(?), 2092(?), 2092, 2095, 2100, 2102, 2102-2105, 2108, 2117, 2156, 2158, 2191, 2191-2192.

Somerville, Robert Brown, 2319, 2319-2320.

Southwick, George, 2128, 2158, 2158-2159.

Spence, Robert, 2077, 2078, 2090-2091, 2091, 2091-2092, 2092, 2092-2095, 2095, 2095-2096, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2098-2099, 2099, 2100, 2100-2101, 2101, 2115, 2116, 2152, 2157, 2168, 2169, 2203-2204, 2204, 2243, 2247, 2282, 2292, 2297, 2308, 2419, 2433.

Stevenson, David Barker, 2044, 2160, 2223, 2247, 2318, 2318-2319, 2409.

Supple, James, 2396.

T

Taché, Joseph Charles, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2128, 2410.

Terrill, Timothy Lee, 2131-2132, 2135, 2159.

Thibaudeau, Joseph Élie, 2065, 2410.

Turcotte, Joseph Édouard, 2077, 2118, 2148, 2186-2187, 2211, 2245, 2308, 2348, 2386, 2396, 2397, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2407, 2419.

V

Valois, Michel François, 2165.

W

Whitney, Hannibal Hodges.

Wilson, John, 2085, 2135-2138, 2186, 2190, 2215, 2259, 2290-2291, 2291, 2291-2292, 2347, 2354, 2356, 2398, 2402, 2435, 2436.

Wright, Amos, 2411.

Y

Yeilding, Agar.

Young, John.

3 1761 11465302 5

